

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS.

A PROGRAM DESIGN FOR  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING  
in the  
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

*Regional criminal  
justice advisory  
board.*





ASSOCIATION OF

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

March 15, 1968


Mr. Jack B. Hoffmann, President  
Association of San Area Governments  
Carson Hotel  
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear President Hoffmann:

A PROGRAM DESIGN FOR  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING  
in the  
SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

The purpose of this plan is to provide a framework for the development of a criminal justice system in the San Francisco Bay Region. The plan is based on the assumption that the criminal justice system is a complex of interrelated components, each of which must be developed in a coordinated manner. The plan is designed to provide a framework for the development of a criminal justice system that is responsive to the needs of the community and that is capable of dealing with the increasing complexity of the criminal justice system. The plan is based on the assumption that the criminal justice system is a complex of interrelated components, each of which must be developed in a coordinated manner. The plan is designed to provide a framework for the development of a criminal justice system that is responsive to the needs of the community and that is capable of dealing with the increasing complexity of the criminal justice system.

The preparation of this plan was financially aided through a grant from the California Council on Criminal Justice pursuant to the provisions of the federal Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2025 with funding from  
State of California and California State Library

The preparation of this plan was financially aided through a grant  
from the California Council on Criminal Justice pursuant to the  
provisions of the Federal Juvenile Crime Control and Life Sentence  
Act of 1968.

<https://archive.org/details/C124909988>

# ASSOCIATION OF



# BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

HOTEL CLAREMONT, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94705 • 841-9730

March 15, 1969

Mr. Jack D. Maltester, President  
Association of Bay Area Governments  
Claremont Hotel  
Berkeley, California 94705

Dear President Maltester:

As Chairman of the Association's Regional Criminal Justice Advisory Committee I am pleased to forward to the Association on behalf of the members of the Board our preliminary report entitled A Program Design for Criminal Justice Planning in the San Francisco Bay Region. The report has been reviewed and approved in principle by the Board and is now being submitted to you and the members of the Executive Committee for review and endorsement.

A substantial amount of additional work is required to complete the assignment of data gathering and establishment of improvement criteria and priorities, as requested by the California Council on Criminal Justice. The time constraints facing the Board and its Task Force groups, however, necessitated certain initial actions to comply with the first stage of the State's Plan Completion Schedule.

The general conclusions of this report are drawn from task force studies; they clearly indicate the need for improvement in the several criminal justice fields. Moreover, funds available through the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 would make many improvements possible. The Act provides that at least 40 per cent of federal funds granted to each state will be available to units of general local governments or to combinations of such units, to participate in the formulation of comprehensive plans for improvement of the criminal justice system.

The need for further research concerning the implications of criminal justice improvement is inherent in the phrase "comprehensive plan." Accordingly, the Board sees among the Region's first challenges further analyses of criminal justice activities and their relationships to each other, using Task Force reports as guideposts. These reports emphasize critical deficiencies, the improvement of which requires increased correlation and cooperation in the activities of prevention, enforcement, courts, corrections, and other social services.





# ASSOCIATION OF



# BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

HOTEL CLAREMONT, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94705 • 841-9730

March 15, 1969

California Council on Criminal Justice  
1108 14th Street  
Sacramento, California

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to your request, we are pleased to transmit to you an advance copy of our report A Program Design for Criminal Justice Planning in the San Francisco Bay Region. We hope this will assist you in developing the State Plan for California. The Association's Regional Criminal Justice Advisory Board approved the program in principle on March 14th as outlined in Chapters X, XI, and XII.

Chapters III through IX, and Appendix A represent condensations and digests, respectively, of Task Force findings and recommendations. Inclusion in this report does not constitute specific endorsement of these, as the Board feels more time and research is needed to consider them in greater detail and to enlarge on possible alternatives; the proposals noted, however, are illustrative of types of improvements necessary in Region V.

This report will be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Association of Bay Area Governments for official review and endorsement. A formal communication from the Committee will follow their next meeting on April 17, 1969.

Sincerely,

*Terry A. Francois*

Terry A. Francois  
Chairman  
Region V Advisory Board

cc: Executive Committee,  
Association of Bay Area Governments





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. FOREWARD	1
II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
A Regional Approach to Problem Solving	5
Need for Coordination	6
Action Projects	7
Informational Needs	7
III. LAW ENFORCEMENT AND POLICE PROCESSES	10
Existing Police System	9
County Sheriffs	9
Municipal Police	9
Police Problems and Needs	10
Equipment	11
Manpower and Utilization of Personnel	11
Primary Goals	12
Coordination of Services	12
Development of Standards	13
Management Improvement	13
IV. ORGANIZED CRIME	14
Existing System for the Suppression of Organized Crime	14
Problems and Needs	15
Primary Goals	17
Alternative One	17
Alternative Two	18
V. JUDICIAL PROCESS	19
Existing System	19
Public Defenders	20
District Attorney	20
Goals	23
Coordination	23
Welfare	23
Research	23
VI. CORRECTIONS	24
Existing System	24
County Jails	24
City Jails	25
Juvenile Facilities	25
Probation Services	26
Parole Services	27
Problems and Needs	28
Goals	29



# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>Page</u>
VII. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	30
Existing System	31
Problems and Needs	32
Primary Goals	34
VIII. NARCOTIC, DRUG, AND ALCOHOL ABUSE	35
Existing System for Reducing Narcotic, Drug, and Alcohol Abuse	36
Problems and Needs	36
Enforcement	36
Prevention	37
Processing of Abusers	38
Primary Goals	39
Planning	39
Enforcement	40
Laboratory Facilities	40
IX. RIOTS AND DISORDERS	42
Existing System for Control of Disorders	42
Problems and Needs	43
Pre-Hostility	43
School District Plan	43
Police Community Relations	43
Hostility	43
Weapons	44
Equipment	44
Training	44
Post-Hostility	44
Primary Goals	44
X. A CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING PROGRAM FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION	46
XI. AN INDEX OF PLANNING PROJECTS	49
Project 1. Inventory and Demographic Study	50
Study Outline	50
Study Requirements	50
Study Objectives	54
Project 2. Communications	55
Study Outline	55
Study Requirements	55
Study Objectives	55
Project 3. Community Relations	57
Study Outline	57
Study Requirements	57
Study Objectives	57





## TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>Page</u>
Project 4. Computer Utilization	58
Study Outline	58
Study Requirements	58
Study Objectives	59
Project 5. Personnel Administration, Recruitment, Training & Education	60
Study Outline	60
Study Requirements	60
Study Objectives	61
Project 6. Records Management	63
Study Outline	63
Study Requirements	63
Study Objectives	64
Project 7. Intelligence Information	65
Study Outline	65
Study Requirements	65
Study Objectives	65
Project 8. Laboratory Services	66
Study Outline	66
Study Requirements	66
Study Objectives	66
Project 9. Juvenile Courts & Corrections	67
Study Outline	67
Study Requirements	67
Study Objectives	67
Project 10. Delinquency Prevention	69
Study Outline	69
Study Requirements	69
Study Objectives	69
Project 11. Locally Administered Adult Corrections	70
Study Outline	70
Study Requirements	70
Study Objectives	71
Project 12. Continuing Regional Criminal Justice Planning	72
Study Outline	72
Study Objectives	73
 XII. IMPLEMENTATION	 74
 ILLUSTRATIVE ORGANIZATION FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING	 76
 APPENDIX A DIGESTS OF PROPOSALS	 A-1
 APPENDIX B MEMBERSHIP OF THE REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD AND TASK FORCES; TASK FORCE REPORTS	 B-1





## I. FOREWORD

The San Francisco Bay Area -- Region V for purposes of comprehensive criminal justice planning -- contains within its 7,000 square miles nine counties, ninety-one cities, at least 500 special local districts, and dozens of state and federal agencies. This region had an estimated 1968 population of 4,589,800 which represents 23 per cent of the total population of California.

The staggering diversity of law enforcement challenges in the San Francisco Bay Area is reflected in the region's many economic, cultural, and population bases. The Area contains several major ports; it is highly industrialized; it attracts increasingly large numbers of visitors and tourists annually; and there are within the region numerous major institutions of higher education. Along with these and many other significant characteristics, it possesses a variety of sociological conditions that place inordinate demands upon the collective criminal justice system and its component organizations. The unusually large number of governmental jurisdictions providing and requiring criminal justice services makes more compelling the need to plan these and companion services in consideration of regional implications as well as individual resources.

The intent of this initial effort toward improvement, as reflected in this plan, is to be comprehensive rather than detailed, and to focus on criminal justice matters that have been identified as common to the jurisdictions, most pressing in the region, and susceptible to area-wide review.



Many ideas and suggestions have been set forth or implied that are innovative and that are significant departures from existing arrangements. Without exception, the individual Task Force Reports have made clear the absolute necessity for new styles of cooperation, sharing of resources, and new approaches to major elements of criminal justice administration if the system is to begin to meet the unique challenges present in the San Francisco Bay Area. Examination of the Task Force Reports reveals that for many law enforcement concerns in Region V, there is no system but rather a large number of related procedures.

The following sections present a preliminary summary, interpretation, and synthesis of Task Force findings. This document, supported by the individual Task Force Reports and proposals appended, constitutes the initial Comprehensive Criminal Justice Plan for Region V, and the Region's application for planning and action program funds. It is a program for planning, and no recommendations are made at this time concerning action projects for individual jurisdictions.

It is recognized and emphasized that this initial effort to identify problems in the broad field of Criminal Justice does not define all such problems, nor does it define all of the more urgent needs. Moreover, it has become clear during the interdisciplinary exchanges produced through the task force approach that more lasting solutions to criminal justice problems also will require new approaches to matters that were not substantially a part of task force assignments. These include, for example, financial policies and resources of governmental units; welfare, employment, and other social services; the apparent cause and effect relationship between criminal justice activities and





the quality and pattern of other local government services; and, finally, impediments to improvement in local services that stem from organizational arrangements of the State Government and statutory requirements.



## II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and recommendations presented herein represent the first significant effort to study comprehensively the region's criminal justice system. The task forces in carrying out their work have made a valuable contribution to the fund of knowledge concerning the administration of criminal justice in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area. While this is the first time that a wide array of such information can be made available from a single source, it is generally recognized that much more is needed.

The division of criminal justice functions into eight subject matter areas, and assignment of these to task forces for study, facilitated a sharper focus upon problems peculiar to the subject matter itself. A further benefit resulted from the mixed composition of task forces in that it allowed an inter-disciplinary approach to identifying serious problems within the several functional areas. The greatest advantage, however, is that it has permitted a review of groups of numerous activities related to each other by process and similar in function, without regard to political and jurisdictional boundaries.

The task force approach is most notable for its effectiveness in "crash" efforts such as the initial study phase has required. The four week time limit imposed for reconnaissance mandated this approach. This constraint, however, resulted in a major shortcoming: time did not permit correlation of problems in one task force functional area with those of others. For example, the Task Force on Judicial Process was





able to identify problems which are prominent among or common to Superior, Municipal, and Justice Courts. These are reflected in the Task Force's recommendations for needed projects and studies. At the same time, there was little time to consider the broad implications of interrelationships of the judicial process to problems identified by other task forces, such as in the fields of corrections or juvenile delinquency, or the organizational structure of the court system as it relates to organization for other criminal justice services. The completion of this work for each of the several functions is essential and will be undertaken as a matter of priority in the continued planning program.

It is not surprising that numerous common threads may be observed in all the task force studies. Recognition of these raises issues pertinent to the purposes of the Regional Advisory Board and points the way in part to the broad questions to which the Board must address itself. The major of these are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

#### A Regional Approach to Problem Solving

The regional approach to solving problems in the administration of criminal justice is recommended in each of the task force reports. While specific recommendations differ as to the type and format of organization needed, there is consensus that regional planning and research resources should be established to continue and enlarge upon the work task forces have begun.



The Association of Bay Area Governments provides a natural vehicle for maintaining regional criminal justice planning. The Criminal Justice Advisory Board should continue in its relationship to the Association, as the policy advisory body for this planning effort. Enlargement and reorganization of the Board so it may better fulfill its role is proposed in a later section, along with recommendations for transformation of the task forces.

#### Need for Coordination

Repeatedly emphasized by the task forces is the difficulty of achieving improved administration of criminal justice activities, given the large number of jurisdictions and agencies that are involved in these processes. Such terms as "cooperation," "coordination," "sharing," and "pooling of resources," are mentioned frequently in connection with needs, problems and goals. On the one hand, the maintenance of local autonomy in police matters has been mentioned as important and, except for dealing with riots and disorders, the possibility of a regional police force has not been explored. On the other hand, the recommendation for functional consolidation of some police processes -- communications and information systems, laboratories, training facilities, and the like -- seems clearly indicated.

The challenge to the Regional Advisory Board in such questions of organization seems equally clear. It should, through further research and study, identify those functions and activities that can be performed more effectively and economically on a cooperative area-wide basis, determine those which are operationally and politically attainable, and represent these interests to citizens of the Region





and to local and State agencies who would provide financial assistance for implementation.

### Action Projects

Numerous "action project" proposals have been received by the task forces and some have been forwarded to the Regional Advisory Board as well as to the California Council on Criminal Justice. Only in a few instances did task forces make specific recommendations for approval or disapproval.

There are several observations to be made in this regard. The California Council on Criminal Justice has not been very specific in defining the kinds of action proposals that could or should be considered in this preliminary stage. Nor has it stated the extent to which such proposals could be funded. If there is to be "planning", and if intelligent priorities are to be established, then a "first come, first served" basis is not acceptable. It seems particularly inappropriate at this time when a general understanding exists that the present study effort is aimed at discovering major problems, designing a program for systematically evaluating needs, and for critically examining present methods of meeting them. Once these and other considerations become relatively apparent, the general priorities can be assigned and action programs devised.

### Informational Needs

All task forces became immediately aware that there is no ready source of systematically assembled information relating to the entire criminal justice system. Where information is available it is generally incomplete; nowhere are needed base-line data summarized for the Region as a whole; nowhere are data concerning the various related disciplines



Many ideas and suggestions have been set forth or implied that are innovative and that are significant departures from existing arrangements. Without exception, the individual Task Force Reports have made clear the absolute necessity for new styles of cooperation, sharing of resources, and new approaches to major elements of criminal justice administration if the system is to begin to meet the unique challenges present in the San Francisco Bay Area. Examination of the Task Force Reports reveals that for many law enforcement concerns in Region V, there is no system but rather a large number of related procedures.

The following sections present a preliminary summary, interpretation, and synthesis of Task Force findings. This document, supported by the individual Task Force Reports and proposals appended, constitutes the initial Comprehensive Criminal Justice Plan for Region V, and the Region's application for planning and action program funds. It is a program for planning, and no recommendations are made at this time concerning action projects for individual jurisdictions.

It is recognized and emphasized that this initial effort to identify problems in the broad field of Criminal Justice does not define all such problems, nor does it define all of the more urgent needs. Moreover, it has become clear during the interdisciplinary exchanges produced through the task force approach that more lasting solutions to criminal justice problems also will require new approaches to matters that were not substantially a part of task force assignments. These include, for example, financial policies and resources of governmental units; welfare, employment, and other social services; the apparent cause and effect relationship between criminal justice activities and





the quality and pattern of other local government services; and, finally, impediments to improvement in local services that stem from organizational arrangements of the State Government and statutory requirements.



## II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and recommendations presented herein represent the first significant effort to study comprehensively the region's criminal justice system. The task forces in carrying out their work have made a valuable contribution to the fund of knowledge concerning the administration of criminal justice in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area. While this is the first time that a wide array of such information can be made available from a single source, it is generally recognized that much more is needed.

The division of criminal justice functions into eight subject matter areas, and assignment of these to task forces for study, facilitated a sharper focus upon problems peculiar to the subject matter itself. A further benefit resulted from the mixed composition of task forces in that it allowed an inter-disciplinary approach to identifying serious problems within the several functional areas. The greatest advantage, however, is that it has permitted a review of groups of numerous activities related to each other by process and similar in function, without regard to political and jurisdictional boundaries.

The task force approach is most notable for its effectiveness in "crash" efforts such as the initial study phase has required. The four week time limit imposed for reconnaissance mandated this approach. This constraint, however, resulted in a major shortcoming: time did not permit correlation of problems in one task force functional area with those of others. For example, the Task Force on Judicial Process was





able to identify problems which are prominent among or common to Superior, Municipal, and Justice Courts. These are reflected in the Task Force's recommendations for needed projects and studies. At the same time, there was little time to consider the broad implications of interrelationships of the judicial process to problems identified by other task forces, such as in the fields of corrections or juvenile delinquency, or the organizational structure of the court system as it relates to organization for other criminal justice services. The completion of this work for each of the several functions is essential and will be undertaken as a matter of priority in the continued planning program.

It is not surprising that numerous common threads may be observed in all the task force studies. Recognition of these raises issues pertinent to the purposes of the Regional Advisory Board and points the way in part to the broad questions to which the Board must address itself. The major of these are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

### A Regional Approach to Problem Solving

The regional approach to solving problems in the administration of criminal justice is recommended in each of the task force reports. While specific recommendations differ as to the type and format of organization needed, there is consensus that regional planning and research resources should be established to continue and enlarge upon the work task forces have begun.



The Association of Bay Area Governments provides a natural vehicle for maintaining regional criminal justice planning. The Criminal Justice Advisory Board should continue in its relationship to the Association, as the policy advisory body for this planning effort. Enlargement and reorganization of the Board so it may better fulfill its role is proposed in a later section, along with recommendations for transformation of the task forces.

### Need for Coordination

Repeatedly emphasized by the task forces is the difficulty of achieving improved administration of criminal justice activities, given the large number of jurisdictions and agencies that are involved in these processes. Such terms as "cooperation," "coordination," "sharing," and "pooling of resources," are mentioned frequently in connection with needs, problems and goals. On the one hand, the maintenance of local autonomy in police matters has been mentioned as important and, except for dealing with riots and disorders, the possibility of a regional police force has not been explored. On the other hand, the recommendation for functional consolidation of some police processes -- communications and information systems, laboratories, training facilities, and the like -- seems clearly indicated.

The challenge to the Regional Advisory Board in such questions of organization seems equally clear. It should, through further research and study, identify those functions and activities that can be performed more effectively and economically on a cooperative area-wide basis, determine those which are operationally and politically attainable, and represent these interests to citizens of the Region





The Association of Bay Area Governments provides a natural vehicle for maintaining regional criminal justice planning. The Criminal Justice Advisory Board should continue in its relationship to the Association, as the policy advisory body for this planning effort. Enlargement and reorganization of the Board so it may better fulfill its role is proposed in a later section, along with recommendations for transformation of the task forces.

### Need for Coordination

Repeatedly emphasized by the task forces is the difficulty of achieving improved administration of criminal justice activities, given the large number of jurisdictions and agencies that are involved in these processes. Such terms as "cooperation," "coordination," "sharing," and "pooling of resources," are mentioned frequently in connection with needs, problems and goals. On the one hand, the maintenance of local autonomy in police matters has been mentioned as important and, except for dealing with riots and disorders, the possibility of a regional police force has not been explored. On the other hand, the recommendation for functional consolidation of some police processes -- communications and information systems, laboratories, training facilities, and the like -- seems clearly indicated.

The challenge to the Regional Advisory Board in such questions of organization seems equally clear. It should, through further research and study, identify those functions and activities that can be performed more effectively and economically on a cooperative area-wide basis, determine those which are operationally and politically attainable, and represent these interests to citizens of the Region



and to local and State agencies who would provide financial assistance for implementation.

### Action Projects

Numerous "action project" proposals have been received by the task forces and some have been forwarded to the Regional Advisory Board as well as to the California Council on Criminal Justice. Only in a few instances did task forces make specific recommendations for approval or disapproval.

There are several observations to be made in this regard. The California Council on Criminal Justice has not been very specific in defining the kinds of action proposals that could or should be considered in this preliminary stage. Nor has it stated the extent to which such proposals could be funded. If there is to be "planning", and if intelligent priorities are to be established, then a "first come, first served" basis is not acceptable. It seems particularly inappropriate at this time when a general understanding exists that the present study effort is aimed at discovering major problems, designing a program for systematically evaluating needs, and for critically examining present methods of meeting them. Once these and other considerations become relatively apparent, the general priorities can be assigned and action programs devised.

### Informational Needs

All task forces became immediately aware that there is no ready source of systematically assembled information relating to the entire criminal justice system. Where information is available it is generally incomplete; nowhere are needed base-line data summarized for the Region as a whole; nowhere are data concerning the various related disciplines





(police, corrections, judicial, etc.) brought together in a meaningful way. Thus, the division and unevenness of criminal justice functions in the Region is paralleled by the lack of correlative research and planning data.

An immediate need is to assemble, correlate and analyze base-line data concerning criminal justice activities. Much of the needed data needs to be generated, and contemplated revision in format by the California Bureau of Criminal Statistics will satisfy part of this need. Additional data is available locally, but needs to be collected. Available population, demographic, economic, and ecological studies can be used, but where these are lacking, the gaps will be filled through additional original research. Region V includes many specialized educational and research resources that would participate in this effort.



The following chapters, III through IX,  
represent, in summary form, the reports  
of the respective Task Forces



### III. LAW ENFORCEMENT AND POLICE PROCESSES

There are 94 local police agencies in Region V. Included are 85 police departments and police districts, and nine sheriffs' departments. The total complement of sworn personnel for the police departments is 5,649, with 1,242 sworn officers serving the sheriffs' departments. More than half the police departments in Region V have fewer than thirty sworn officers. Thus, fragmentation of police resources is as serious a problem to Region V as it is anywhere in the State. Excluded from discussion are state and federal police and enforcement agencies.

#### Existing Police System

Detailed studies of individual law enforcement agencies have not been made because of limited time and resources. However, the following general comments may be made concerning police organization.

#### County Sheriffs

County Sheriffs in Region V are elected officials and, in general carry out their functions in collaboration with the County Administrator and Board of Supervisors of their counties. The Under-Sheriff, or other appointive administrative head, in many counties actually serves as does the Chief of Police in a municipal department. Department organizational structures are nearly the same in all Sheriffs' Departments except for those basic differences arising from variation in size among them.

#### Municipal Police

Police Departments are each headed by an appointive Chief, who in almost all instances reports to a City Manager, who is responsible in turn to the City Council or Mayor. Depending upon size, a department may have a Deputy Chief, Captain, or Lieutenant as second in command and an administrative organization that includes components for investigations, patrol, traffic, special services, juvenile, and other activities. There is little apparent departure from traditional police organization, and few differences exist in organizational format among departments.





The 94 local police agencies operate with relative autonomy. Recruitment, training, equipping of personnel, and the like, are performed on an individual basis. Because the individual departments belong to separate governmental units, there are few indications of cooperative, joint, or coordinated approaches to such common supporting services as purchasing, supply of equipment, training, or other areas. Similarly, budgetary support is entirely a local matter and lies within the discretionary power of a city council or board of supervisors. Manpower in most cases is limited and inadequate. Inadequacies are often attributable to unwise or wasteful use of an officer's time which may be consumed by many duties not appropriate to the police function, for example, business licenses, zoning laws, meter violations, lost dogs, etc. An added irritant is that promotional opportunities are almost entirely confined to individual departments; lateral transfer is very infrequent. Retirement systems and fringe benefits vary in nearly every jurisdiction and few Region V agencies pay officers the same salary for the same work. In other respects, police departments do not perform optimally in the effective suppression of crime. Most agencies operate beat systems and shift schedules as they were operated twenty years ago. Moreover, few studies have been undertaken to assure that present organizational and operations practices meet the criteria of good management and that they satisfy the bona fide law enforcement demands of our citizens.

#### Police Problems and Needs

Any discussion of police problems and needs must take into consideration the general review of deficiencies, above. Those needs which are more than superficial or technical, or which are not internal to a single department, cannot be solved by money alone. It has been viewed by some as important that law enforcement processes remain close to the people and under local control. But many problems and issues concerning police processes and law enforcement in Region V not only transcend the spheres of control of any one jurisdiction, but they eclipse the resources and capabilities of any one jurisdiction to deal with them confidently.

It is difficult to rationalize the apparent contradiction of superior police personnel and better recruitment, training, and equipment with the poor public image presented by law enforcement today. New technology, improved



management techniques, and better organization are all important needs in the field of law enforcement. At the same time, new means of evaluating and redefining the roles of police, corrections, and other functions in the criminal justice family are long overdue. There are, perhaps, no other local government functions that could lend themselves so readily to adaptation, harmonious response to critical situations, and coordinated effort.

It would appear then, that important and rapid steps must be taken to identify and resolve those contradictions which inhibit these responses. The following review of problems and needs is illustrative and not exhaustive; a more detailed discussion may be found in the report of the Law Enforcement Task Force.

#### Equipment

Most of the Region's departments lack modern and sufficient equipment. Most departments require officers to furnish at least their own weapons and safety equipment. Shotguns, tear-gas, and other weaponry is furnished by the department, but this policy is uneven among jurisdictions. It is reported by department administrators that equipment is adequate only for coping with routine problems. The use of currently available technological aids is minimal: communications systems are archaic and outmoded; investigative equipment is cumbersome, usually old, and does not meet today's needs. Even where modern equipment is available, most officers are not trained effectively to use it. Vehicles often are not designed to do the job and are purchased simply because of a low bid. Users of the vehicles are rarely consulted on their design.

#### Manpower and Utilization of Personnel

Manpower resources are readily available under mutual-aid pacts, though problems of communication, supervision, planning, and other functional aspects result when moving officers from one jurisdiction to another. There are philosophical, financial, and logistical considerations which prevent mutual aid from being as effective as it is generally believed to be. Recent efforts have been made to establish a mutual-aid frequency on a regional basis, while other needs such as for coordinated riot control training are sorely lacking. The State is in a position to augment locally available manpower with the Highway Patrol, but only on a limited basis.





### Primary Goals

Related to manpower needs is the question of defining better the duties and responsibilities of police officers. Opinions differ among police professionals and administrators as well as among criminal justice scholars. Some feel the job of a professional police officer should place greater emphasis on control of crime, while others see the need for greater involvement by police in noncriminal activities, contending that the latter offers the greatest promise for crime reduction.

In any event, new approaches must be tried and evaluated. Traditional wisdom and so-called proven methods, as the preceding paragraphs indicate, are not sufficiently effective. It would be a mistake to assume that police agencies and personnel can together bring about the needed change. Real progress in solving the problems that confront the police and the criminal justice administration generally will require greater interaction with all the elements of local government and its political processes. Moreover, important issues must be resolved relating to functions that are not now under the strict control of any one local unit or department, but which affect local jurisdictional performance. These and other points are emphasized in the following sections and in the reports of the several Task Forces.

### Coordination of Services

The Task Force's number one priority was for the use of coordinated services. The Region should make the best possible use of its present resources, including services and facilities as well as manpower. There should be discussion of regional use of manpower under mutual-aid pacts, joint powers agreements, and specialized technology. There are many activities such as crime laboratories, training, recruitment, investigation, planning, and research that can be provided on a cooperative basis and still allow agencies to maintain their local autonomy. Emphasis should be placed on planning and research, and on developing modern technological resources that are presently available. It has been pointed out that many departments lack the necessary resources for recruiting and training personnel or for providing the field services necessary to cope with the problems of crime. Increased pooling of resources



is essential in the development of these and other services that can then be provided more effectively and economically on a cooperative area-wide basis.

#### Development of Standards

The absence of standards by which to judge police processes became apparent to the Law Enforcement Task Force. It was emphasized that standards must be established so that problems can be properly reviewed and evaluated; these standards should mean the same thing to all persons. Even in the area of crime reporting, different officers will report the same crime differently even though the elements presented to both are the same. Therefore, it seems imperative that some criteria be established as a basic standard for reviewing needs and deficiencies.

#### Management Improvement

A primary objective should be to take a hard look at the police process, its deficiencies, and its problems. Deficiencies that exist in departmental operations should be determined, and standards should be established that would apply to police agencies of all sizes in the State of California. Initial goals should include planning and research activities to establish standards so that informed management judgments may be made. This particular problem is one of major priority.



#### IV. ORGANIZED CRIME

The San Francisco Bay Area provides numerous opportunities for the operation of organized crime. While the more common manifestations of organized criminal activities (numbers rackets, shylocking, etc.) such as exist in the Eastern states are not readily apparent, organization does exist in other major criminal fields including prostitution, burglary, stolen property, narcotics, and some forms of gambling.

For the purposes of discussion in this section Organized Crime is defined as follows:

An association or confederation of persons who through agreement, practice, or design, intend to and/or do commit a series of criminal acts to further their pecuniary interests and whose programs are inimical to the welfare of the community.

There are "Syndicate" or "Mafia" individuals who reside in this region, and all law enforcement is aware of the major shift of well-known Eastern hoodlums to the Western United States. Because of its tremendous economic activity California has attracted the investment of illicit money in legitimate business; recent reports on organized crime activity in California indicate that Syndicate money is being funneled into legitimate business. The extent that such money is being invested in California is unknown, but it is believed to be considerable.

#### Existing System for the Suppression of Organized Crime

The administration of police services by local units of government was reviewed briefly in the preceding Law Enforcement Section. In addition to the county, city and other police agencies noted, other law enforcement units are concerned with various aspects of organized crime. A partial listing of these provides a greater insight into the difficulty





of investigation and intelligence-gathering functions in Region V.

District Attorneys' Offices: (9)

Federal Agencies and Functions:

Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Internal Revenue Service  
Security and Exchange Commission  
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Enforcement  
Labor Law Enforcement  
Post Office Inspection  
Bureau of Narcotics

State Agencies and Functions:

Department of Justice, Bureau of  
Identification & Investigation  
Bureau of Narcotics  
Professional and Vocational Standards  
California Highway Patrol  
Motor Vehicles  
Alcohol Beverage Control  
Franchise Tax  
State Police  
State College and University Police

Problems and Needs

When organized crime flourishes, it does so throughout the metropolitan area without recognition of City or County boundaries. However, each of the local agencies, police departments, sheriffs' offices, and District Attorneys' offices have specific geographic jurisdiction. Even though cooperative agreements may be affected, the problem of organized crime control remains difficult as these local agencies are usually the first to discover and recognize its existence and have primary responsibility for its investigation. It is at least equally as difficult to achieve coordination among the numerous state and federal agencies which share a deep interest in the discovery and reduction of organized criminal activity. Specific problems and needs are summarized below. A more detailed review may be found in the report of the Task Force on Organized Crime.



The greatest obstacle to improving the investigation and suppression of organized crime is the absence of adequate centrally-available intelligence information, and the fractionated approach to organized crime control. At present, organized crime is apparently more mobile than organized law enforcement. Although there is a free flow of information between various law enforcement agencies on request, these agencies maintain no central comprehensive recordkeeping or intelligence unit. Thus problems that develop in one jurisdiction and which overlap into other jurisdictions may not come under investigation for some time in the overlap area.

As there is no comprehensive approach to gathering and dissemination of intelligence information or to the investigation of organized crime, many local jurisdictions have assigned these functions to officers in conjunction with other duties. Usually the various jurisdictions confine their investigation and intelligence gathering to their own boundaries and there is no satisfactory method of disseminating information between jurisdictions. Funds are not available to conduct comprehensive or long-range informant programs, and an individual administrator is not inclined to allot money for such programs unless the information obtained is directly related to a criminal offense within his area of responsibility.

Because of the many agencies involved in the metropolitan Bay Area, it is almost impossible to inaugurate and sustain a long-term investigation which involves several jurisdictions and agencies. The San Francisco Police Department, for example, has an effective, well-qualified intelligence unit; however, its total energies are not directed into the field of organized crime and its jurisdiction lies only within the City and County of San Francisco.

It has been impossible properly to fund a comprehensive area-wide central information or intelligence bank. There has been organized within the California Department of Justice a Bureau of CII, to combat organized crime. There are six Special Agents assigned to this unit in San Francisco. This unit is comparatively new and has confined itself primarily to intelligence gathering functions -- no in-depth investigation has been undertaken in this region. This unit could be a nucleus to approach the intelligence information problem on an area-wide basis, if it possessed adequate manpower



and financial resources. At present, the Bureau agents must depend on local agencies to supply information and assistance in the investigations.

Several other organizations exist for the purpose of intelligence gathering. The Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit founded in 1956 is at present a nation-wide organization. One of the major shortcomings of the LIEU system is that information gathering is at the option of the local agency. The Bay Area Law Enforcement and Security Liaison group is another organization formed for intelligence purposes. Again, this unit has no central record-keeping function and makes no concerted effort to collect area-wide data or to develop cases. Further complicating the matter, local jurisdictions are often reluctant to share information with other agencies, especially if they feel their own investigation would be hampered.

### Primary Goals

This section has discussed in broad terms the basic issues of inadequate information systems and the need for increased coordination and productivity from the Region's Law Enforcement resources. The goals suggested are based upon this preliminary study. It is necessary that this be followed by a more detailed analysis and evaluation of the possible alternatives for reducing organized crime activities. Undoubtedly, changes proposed and implemented in other areas of the criminal justice system will bear upon the effectiveness with which organized crime can continue to operate. The alternatives suggested below are more fully detailed in the report of the Task Force on Organized Crime. Both alternatives recommend a comprehensive approach that includes establishment of a central records and information source, and pooling or sharing of personnel and equipment.

### Alternative One

An organization should be established composed of local officers, detached from their respective departments and assigned to the Department of Justice, Bureau of CII for at least one year. The one year minimum assignment is necessary because of the long duration of investigations





and to maintain continuity in the informant programs. (Successful investigation of organized crime relies heavily upon informants.) These officers would be familiar with problems, individuals, and the geographic areas within their present jurisdictions. Under this arrangement, local agencies would develop a sense of participation and accomplishment in the overall program. This kind of program would provide the exchange of intelligence information among various departments and assignment of officers to the Department of Justice would permit the Attorney General to appoint them as peace officers with area-wide jurisdiction and control.

An equipment pool of the latest and most sophisticated electronic surveillance devices and photographic equipment should be established, and all personnel should be trained in its proper use. The equipment pool would be available for the entire region and could be supplied to local agencies for special investigations on request.

#### Alternative Two

An alternative to forming a pool of men and equipment as suggested above is to expand the Department of Justice organized crime unit and to designate regular officers in local jurisdictions who would assist in investigations in their local areas. The officers assigned would have responsibility for forwarding all intelligence information to Bureau of CII agents, and would also serve as clearing points for information requests originating in their own departments. This would provide for confidentiality of information.



## V. JUDICIAL PROCESS

Courts in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area are of three types: superior, municipal, and justice. There are a total of 92 Superior Court judgeships ranging in number from twenty-four in San Francisco County to two in Napa County. Of the 71 Municipal Courts in the region, Alameda and Santa Clara Counties each have a high of 17 while Napa County has none. Finally, there are 28 Justice Courts of which eleven are in Contra Costa County; neither San Francisco County nor San Mateo County has Justice Courts.

### Existing System

Courts are organized on a county basis and judgeships are filled by popular election. There is a presiding judge at the Superior and Municipal levels who serves as the administrator for those courts and makes assignments of judges to the several civil and criminal courts. Judges tend to rotate from criminal to civil courts on a year-to-year basis (with the exception of juvenile court judges under the Superior Court who often spend several years in that position). The process of annual rotation gives judges a wide range of experience but at the same time may work to slow down the development of expertise, and may allow a judge whose entire professional career prior to joining the bench was in one area to be hearing cases on topics about which he has no practical knowledge.

Superior Courts conduct and process felony criminal trials, appeals from lower courts, and juvenile hearings. Municipal Courts conduct and process misdemeanor criminal cases, preliminary hearings for felony cases, and misdemeanor traffic cases. Justice Courts are found in less populated areas that cannot support a Municipal Court; these are "one man" courts which also may hear misdemeanor cases and preliminary hearings.

The workload for the Superior and Municipal Courts in the region has been increasing at a rate greater than that for the State as a whole. Superior Court criminal felony filings for the State increased by 8.2% in fiscal year 1966-67. During the same period of time Municipal Court



filings for the State rose 7%. In Region V during the same period, Superior Court criminal filings climbed 12% and Municipal Courts had a 15% increase. Juvenile filings in Superior Courts throughout the State were reported to have increased 4%, while in Region V they increased 9%. Selected information for these courts is shown on the accompanying table.

#### Public Defenders

All but one of the Region's counties have a Public Defender system for the defense of indigents accused of crimes. The size of the Public Defender staffs varies widely. For example, Alameda County has 30 full-time deputies plus a full-time staff of investigators. Marin and Sonoma Counties each have one full-time Chief Public Defender and three part-time assistants; the assistants are permitted outside practice and have no investigative assistance. All Chief Public Defenders are appointed by the County Board of Supervisors, except in San Francisco where he is popularly elected. There is no formal arrangement for coordination of efforts between counties, but there is general willingness among the offices to assist each other.

The availability of statistics varies because personnel generally are not available to compile such data. There is at present no statewide publication of Public Defender statistics, nor are there many common definitions for the activities conducted by these agencies. All of these offices, as with the other agencies in the administration of justice, are understaffed. Considering that the office of Public Defender in one of the counties is only six months old, and other counties are staffed by part-time personnel, there would seem to be a very real need for an organized, uniform compilation of statistics as well as for an attempt to develop uniform methods of handling cases.

#### District Attorney

Each county has a popularly elected District Attorney. In most counties this office prosecutes all criminal cases and many civil cases. The power of the District Attorney is almost exclusive in the initiation of criminal proceedings. The size of District Attorney staffs in this





Selected Data for Superior, Municipal, and Justice Courts

by County in Region V

Fiscal Year 1966-67

<u>County</u>	<u>Estimated Population</u>	<u>Superior Courts</u>		<u>Municipal Courts</u>		<u>Justice Courts</u>	
		<u>Judges</u>	<u>Filings</u>	<u>Judges</u>	<u>Filings</u>	<u>Judges</u>	<u>Filings</u>
Alameda	1,069,900	20	5,434	17	310,416	2	17,598
Santa Clara	1,011,900	17	4,508	17	236,339	1	13,506
San Francisco	748,700	24	5,883	15	195,674	--	--
San Mateo	553,700	9	2,413	8	111,232	--	--
Contra Costa	550,800	9	2,303	7	75,492	11	31,182
Marin	207,400	4	753	3	35,470	1	260
Sonoma	194,600	4	996	2	21,485	5	11,532
Solano	172,600	3	714	2	10,928	5	30,874
Napa	80,200	2	278	--	--	3	12,129
		TOTAL FILINGS:					
		23,282		997,036		117,081	



region also vary considerably. Alameda County has 56 full-time and 2 part-time deputies, plus 15 investigators. Napa County at the opposite extreme has three full-time deputies and one part-time deputy, and four full-time investigators.

Although workload varies, in most counties it is excessive. The increase in court filings discussed above reflects only part of the pressure placed upon District Attorneys, as they must consider many cases which are never prosecuted. Moreover, arrest rates have increased much faster than filing rates. The following table reflects the problems that District Attorneys face.

<u>County</u>	<u>Per Cent Increase Adult Felony Arrests, 1966-67</u>	<u>Per Cent Arrestees Released by District Attorney, 1967</u>
Solano	41.2	20.1
Marin	37.5	15.6
Contra Costa	31.8	5.1
San Francisco	27.4	10.9
San Mateo	22.1	19.7
Alameda	19.2	10.4
Santa Clara	19.2	11.7
Sonoma	17.8	19.7
Napa	Not given	--

While the number of juries sworn in during fiscal year 1966-67 declined throughout the state for both Superior and Municipal Courts, seven of the Bay Area's nine counties showed an increase for Superior Courts and two counties showed a gain for Municipal Courts. The District Attorney of Alameda County is expecting a 50% to 100% increase in jury trials in 1969 over 1968.

All counties lack sufficient investigators to process pre-trial work. Consequently, the District Attorney is forced into presenting cases which have not been adequately prepared.

Coordination of effort between District Attorneys works on an individual case basis and, while there is cooperation between offices when



the need arises, caseload pressures limit this type of assistance. Also, as there is no common method of pre-trial investigation, the type and quality of data available varies among jurisdictions.

### Goals

The goals for improving judicial processes fall into three categories: coordination of effort among jurisdictions, increased concern for the welfare of the accused and the community, and research into many of the basic assumptions concerning the organization, administration, and functions of the judicial process.

Coordination. Many of the problems discussed are common to both Superior and Municipal courts and to all judicial districts. There is an increasing need for standards and procedures that recognize the interdependence of judicial institutions among themselves and among other criminal justice functions.

Welfare. By concerning ourselves with the treatment of the accused, we are also concerning ourselves with the safety and welfare of the community.

Research. It is fairly easy to ask questions concerning the organization and administration of justice, but the right questions are not always apparent. In order to determine which are the right questions and then to work toward answering them, it will be necessary to develop a strong research program. The report of the Task Force on Judicial Problems sets forth a number of research projects to begin such a program.





## VI. CORRECTIONS

This report is concerned with those facilities and programs used in the supervision, detention, and rehabilitation of law violators from the time of arrest to the time of final release or discharge, to the end that the incidence of crime by repeat offenders may be reduced. These facilities and programs range from city lockups, county jails, and informal probation to formal probation, parole services, and minimum, medium, and maximum security prisons.

### Existing System

The following sections describe present correctional facilities and services in Region V.

#### County Jails

County jails are under the jurisdiction of the county sheriffs, who are responsible for custody of prisoners prior to trial and for the care of all defendants sentenced for misdemeanor crimes.

All of the county jails in Region V are understaffed; most are physically obsolete and inadequately equipped for the number of persons confined in them. Several of the counties are interested in developing programs such as work furlough, camp systems, or educational instruction for inmates, but few have sufficient funds to do so.

Budgetary information has not been collected, but the following table shows the approximate population of county jails and camps as of September, 1967.

Adult Prisoners in County Jails and Camps  
September 22, 1967

	Total	<u>County Jails</u>		<u>County Camps</u>
		Not Sentenced	Sentenced	Sentenced
San Francisco	1,057	856	201	--
Alameda	960	34	324	602
Santa Clara	873	195	220	458
San Mateo	321	81	103	137
Contra Costa	264	50	72	142
Sonoma	169	73	34	62
Solano	99	50	49	--
Marin	35	15	20	--
Napa	17	7	10	--
Bay Area:	3,795 <sup>1/</sup>	1,361	1,033	1,401

2,434 sentenced prisoners

<sup>1/</sup> Includes 11 juveniles.



City Jails

City jails are operated by local police departments and are operated only as holding facilities. There is no published information concerning the number, population, or expenditures for such facilities.

Juvenile Facilities

Juvenile facilities are operated under county juvenile probation authorities. The facilities consist of Juvenile Halls for temporary custody, and camps, homes, and ranches for more long-term and rehabilitative purposes.

Juvenile Halls are intended for the detention of juveniles who have come under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court and who cannot be released prior to their hearings. Because of the nature of their use, population fluctuates greatly. There is, at present, enabling legislation for regional or sub-regional Juvenile Halls; but as of January, 1968, none reportedly had been established.

Number of JuvenilesAdmitted to Juvenile Halls

1967 <sup>1/</sup>

Alameda	4,071
San Francisco	3,714
Santa Clara	3,084
Contra Costa	1,390
San Mateo	1,255
Sonoma	705
Marin	388
Solano	301
Napa	111

<sup>1/</sup> Crime and Delinquency in California, 1967; Bureau of Criminal Statistics, California Department of Justice.



The county "camps," "homes," and "ranches" are used for sentenced juveniles whom it is felt may benefit from these kinds of rehabilitative facilities. The length of stay is not decided at time of sentencing, but is determined by the juvenile's behavior during his stay.

County Camps, Ranches, and Homes

Number and Population

December 31, 1967

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Population</u>
Alameda	4	227
Santa Clara	3	157
San Francisco	2	114
San Mateo	2	74
Contra Costa	1	48
Sonoma	1	17
Marin	0	--
Napa	0	--
Solano	1/3 <u>1/</u>	Unknown

1/ Facility shared with two other counties, neither of which belongs to Region V.

Probation Services

There are nine county probation departments in Region V, each headed by a Chief Probation Officer who is appointed by the judge of the criminal Superior Court in that county. Major functions of probation are to conduct background investigations of defendants prior to sentencing and to supervise those individuals who are not incarcerated. Size of probation staff varies widely among counties, as do workloads. The variance in size is accompanied by a variety of specializations within the several departments. All counties have staff assigned to both juvenile and adult offenders, but there are few other similarities. For example, the Alameda County Adult Division has 21 deputies with an average caseload of 16,





working on the state subsidy program; 27 deputies are assigned to the special pre-sentence investigations; eight deputies are assigned to the special problem unit which deals with cases involving narcotics and alcohol; and 21 deputies with general supervision cases that average 170 offenders per officer. In Napa County, three deputies supervise 164 probationers each and conduct an average of 12 pre-sentence investigations per month. The San Francisco Probation Department is currently experiencing a strike by deputies seeking a lower caseload; its 24 probation officers have an average caseload of 270 cases and are required to conduct approximately 20 pre-sentence investigations per month.

Regardless of the degree of specialization or level of average caseload (which varies from a high of 270 to a low of 65), there is not one county in the region which has a general supervision caseload at the level of 50 or less, as recommended by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Of the nine adult probation departments, five have caseload rates at least three times greater than is recommended and two are more than twice that figure.

Caseloads for juvenile probation have not been carefully analyzed at this time, but a partial survey discloses problems similar to those found in adult probation.

### Parole Services

Parole is a state function aimed at the supervision of individuals released from state correctional institutions. Currently there are 2,800 adults on parole in Region V who are supervised by a staff of 93: 8 administrators, 73 parole agents, 4 case work trainees, and 8 sub-professionals. There are state regional offices in San Francisco, Santa Rosa, Oakland, and San Jose.

In this region there are five private half-way houses as well as one state-owned facility working to ease the parolee back into society. It is estimated that there are 344 public and private organizations within this region which are in some way related to parole or parolees.



### Problems and Needs

The correctional process in Region V is portrayed in a multiplicity of functions, insufficiently staffed, and contained by county boundaries which have little apparent utility in the correctional field.

It is frequently the case that offenders are supervised by correctional agencies in counties other than their county of residence. The increasing workloads of investigative and supervisory staff suggests that greater efficiency could result from more sharing of special resources.

Investigation and supervision on a broader geographic basis would allow greater flexibility for the courts, more mobility of scarce personnel, and better services to probationers. An approach should be sought that would bring together in certain areas welfare, public health, and other social services required by those persons with problems and in need of help.

While disparity in sentencing practice is a judicial matter, its consequences are visited on the correctional resources. These are affected both by the proportion of cases assigned to a particular correctional alternative (e.g., Superior Court probation), and the period of stay for offenders so assigned. Availability of correctional resources is, in turn, an important factor in determining sentencing judgments.

It is extremely important that probation resources are not dissipated on cases where services are essentially unnecessary, and one promising course of action would consist of identifying and removing such cases from probation. It seems highly advisable to explore in depth the terms currently being served by probationers, and to devote considerable attention to developing criteria to employ in the determination of which cases could appropriately be terminated from supervision.

Building on the trust and cooperation already existing between correctional agencies in the region, it has been suggested that sub-regional programs be studied which would allow for the sharing or development of sub-regional camp facilities, central information systems, crime



laboratories, and training facilities. A regional or sub-regional system for custody and rehabilitation could easily have its own staff, releasing deputies now employed in jail facilities to work on law enforcement.

Adequate data concerning jail populations and changes in population are lacking, as is comprehensive information on misdemeanants processed through Municipal and Justice Courts.

### Goals

It is the feeling of those in corrections with whom the task force has come into contact that there is a compelling need for change in the approaches to corrections. The task force was able to identify certain features which seemed to characterize those views as follows:

1. There is a new readiness on the part of correctional administrators to conduct a fundamental review of present policies and procedure, in an atmosphere of receptivity to new ideas.
2. There is a serious discontent with the constraints and limitations of conventional correctional procedures -- and a recognition that these limitations cannot be overcome merely by additions of personnel and services of the traditional type.
3. There is a conviction that ways must be found to involve the community and private citizens and groups in correctional efforts, particularly prior to and following incarceration.
4. There is a recognition that new and hitherto untapped sources of correctional manpower are now available, and a determination to overcome obstacles to their utilization. It is acknowledged that these resources ought not, in all cases, be absorbed into the formal administrative structure, but might more profitably and more effectively be engaged on a contract basis.
5. These new manpower resources include selected and selectively talented ex-offenders, as well as members of the indigenous minority communities and may have significant contributions to make in the fields of treatment, research, correctional training, and public education. There is an awareness of the compatibility of these contributions to the idea of offender-restitution and to the goal of reconciliation by mutual service.





## VII. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The number of juvenile arrests is increasing each year and the rate of juvenile crime is not being significantly reduced. Even though the rate of juvenile offenses per unit population may not be varying greatly (and that cannot be reliably determined through 1968 as yet), the fact that more than 86,000 young people were arrested in Region V in 1967 provides reason for concern. If the statistics from the Berkeley Police Juvenile Bureau are a valid indication, the region as a whole may expect a significant rise in drug cases, runaway cases, and selected felonies.

Juvenile arrests in the Bay Area counties (except Napa County) rose from 81,270 in 1966 to 86,350 in 1967 -- an increase of 5,080 arrests. Of these, 1,952 were from Santa Clara county and 2,548 were from San Francisco, leaving only 580 distributed among the remaining counties. Selected statistics for Region V are tabulated below.

### Juvenile Delinquency Arrests in Region V

1967

County	Total	Handled In Dept.	Referred to Other Agency	Placed on Probation
Alameda	24,084	9,229	606	14,249
Santa Clara	16,521	6,638	608	9,275
Contra Costa	14,203	8,175	285	5,743
San Francisco	12,555	2,717	1	9,837
San Mateo	8,439	3,996	488	3,955
Marin	3,768	2,074	126	1,568
Sonoma	3,414	1,307	40	2,067
Solano	3,366	1,965	53	1,348
Napa	1,244	525	24	695



### Existing System

The manner of dealing with juvenile offenders in California is prescribed by state law in sections of the Welfare and Institutions Code. This procedure was the subject of legislative scrutiny a few years ago. As a result, the Code was extensively amended to conform to the recommendations of the legislative study committee. According to law, juveniles are categorized as dependents, incorrigibles, and law violators. Official concern with juvenile offenders rests usually, in the first instance, with the police, the probation officers, and the Juvenile Court judges.

Many police and sheriffs' departments have assigned officers as specialists in the juvenile field. These officers often receive special training and are usually involved in the development of department policy concerning juvenile affairs. They are usually called "Juvenile Officers" even though many of them are in fact Sergeants, Lieutenants or Captains in their departments. They work closely with the probation officers and with the community.

The law establishes, in each county, a Juvenile Justice Commission of not less than seven members. The counties may also provide a Delinquency Prevention Commission with the primary duty to coordinate delinquency prevention programs within the county.

The Juvenile Court Judge is a Superior Court judge who has been designated by the Presiding or Senior Superior Court judge to hear the juvenile court cases. In "one judge" counties, the same judge assumes both Superior and Juvenile Court duties and conforms to appropriate procedures in each Court.

Each county establishes a probation department. The Chief Probation Officer is appointed by the Juvenile Court Judge after nomination by the Juvenile Justice Commission. Deputy probation officers are appointed by the Chief probation officer with the assent of the Juvenile Justice Commission and the Judge. Counties operating under charters may operate differently. The probation department is under the general administrative direction of the Board of Supervisors. Many of their duties are prescribed by law and include, among other things, investigating the circumstances of taking juveniles into custody, the preparing of background information on



these juveniles and their families, and recommending to the Juvenile Court judge actions to be taken in specific cases. The judge, however, is not bound by these recommendations. The probation officer also receives juveniles referred to him by the Juvenile Court and attempts to provide rehabilitative follow-up using whatever facilities appear appropriate.

### Problems and Needs

To obtain information concerning the dimensions of the juvenile delinquency problem, a questionnaire was developed and mailed to the Chairmen of Boards of Supervisors, Mayors, City Managers, Sheriffs, Chiefs of Police, Juvenile Court Judges, Chief Probation Officers, and Delinquency Prevention Commissions in the cities and counties within the nine-county area comprising Region V.

A wide variety of responses resulted, and while substantial agreement was noted in many respects, fundamental differences emerged in the philosophy of juvenile delinquency control. The responses may be classified into three general groups:

The first group emphasizes the need to improve the moral climate of the communities, to develop parental responsibility and to improve the quality of home and family life. The second group suggests the solution lies in the revision of existing statutes and procedures, increase of restraints and controls, and establishment of swift, fair, but certain, punishment. The third group suggests a sociological approach with emphasis on non-custodial use of educational, recreational, psychological, and community rehabilitation aids; it also emphasizes the need for the early identification of delinquent tendencies in the very young and the use of appropriate preventive treatment. Common among all respondents was the suggestion that more education about delinquency and its treatment is necessary for parents, youth, professionals, community, specialists in youth work, police, and teachers.

Numerous responses indicated a need for more personnel -- particularly for more well-trained professionals and specialists. There was no need for greatly increased physical plant (with the exception of office space), although certain cities did have needs for special purpose facilities.





There is increasing concern for the magnitude of the problems of delinquency. There are indications that some current methods are unsuitable and require urgent and extensive revision. There is also a need for more background investigation and for careful scrutiny of the effect of existing legislation on the offender and on society. The Task Force identified the following specific problems:

Gross overloading of the system at all levels including intake, police, courts, and probation.

Recidivism rate presently tolerated by society is undefined.

Free exchange of information among agencies and between agencies and professionals is impeded at times by statute and policy.

Police need guidance information about referrals, often an officer has a juvenile with a problem of health, special education, transportation, etc., and cannot find out readily to whom it should be referred.

Problems of predominant offenders such as truants, runaways, incorrigibles, drop-outs, etc., seem to defy solution and need special study.

Juvenile drug use has skyrocketed to alarming proportions.

A contemporary definition of delinquency is needed.

Lack of citizen cooperation is providing increased opportunity for delinquency.

No adequate facility normally is available to treat very young offenders.

Foster home legislation requires re-examination in order to increase the number of homes available.

The changing trend from a paternalistic to an adversary proceeding philosophy in Juvenile Courts requires scrutiny.

Semantic problems exist between agencies concerned with juvenile procedures with respect to the definitions and terminologies of the elements involved.

Prosecuting attorneys in juvenile adversary proceedings require more specialized training.



The changing role of the family in society and its effect on delinquency should be studied.

Alienation of youth from society and its effect on delinquency should be studied.

#### Primary Goals

In attempting to develop a comprehensive long-term and initial action program the difficulties presented by the limited time available for this study became apparent. Nevertheless, the information developed so far is sufficiently sound to demonstrate many of the types of needs which might well be met through action projects.

A list of such projects, arranged in order of suggested priority, has been prepared. It is hoped that these may, on the one hand, stimulate the jurisdictions to action, and on the other hand serve as a guideline to the types of programs the Task Force deems appropriate. Proposals for regional planning and research and for typical action projects are detailed in the body of the report of the Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency.



## VIII. NARCOTIC, DRUG, AND ALCOHOL ABUSE

Few if any topics of social concern and discourse today can match that of narcotics and drugs in emotionalism and general social anxiety. At least some of the reasons for this are clear. In the first place, parents can best guide the growth of their children through experiences they have gone through themselves, and obviously their base of experience is lacking here. Secondly, the dizzying, even staggering growth in numbers of people now introducing mind-altering substances into their bodies has increased our concern proportionately.

In such an emotional atmosphere, several things that have not happened have made the problem more acute. Research on the physical effects of many of the substances has been minimal. Such research has not been encouraged, or else has been discouraged, and in instances has actually been prevented by the unwillingness of official possessors of some substances to release them for research by reputable scientists.

Still another product of the anxiety and the emotional reactions coming from it is that many hospitals will not admit a drug abuser for treatment, while others have a quota, often very small, which they will accept. One can only reason, in such cases, that the seriousness of the "social crime" outweighs the traditional concern for caring for the ill.

An oversimplified reasoning on drug usage has also led to the formation of "committed camps" concerning the problem, each characterized by some degree of tunnel vision. For their part, the young users typically continue their experiences (for a range of reasons, including some very complex social and psychological ones) with a lack of anxiety about damaging results and with the view that adults simply don't know what they are talking about. Still another camp tends to understand the social pressures which often produce such usage and identify more with the youngsters than with the society's policies of enforcement or the police who carry them out. They usually do not see, however, the more tragic effects of excessive usage, or the callous trafficker in such substances whose motive is economic rather than humanistic. The police, on the other hand, tend to deal -- in this problem as in others -- with cases of serious



social disruption, where effective social interaction has broken down. They often do not see the problem from the point of view of the person who deals with the psychological difficulties which underlie it, or who sees the social conditions which produce consequences, of which drug usage may be but the most obvious.

### Existing System for Reducing Narcotic , Drug, and Alcohol Abuse

Society's present handling of the problem of mind-altering substances does not qualify under the heading of "system" in the sense that the concerns of some of the other Task Forces do, and certainly it is not a "system" in the way it should be. Thus, a discussion of systematization in this regard necessarily leads to the need for a system, rather than the presence of one.

It is clear that this problem has been treated much too narrowly; a far broader, more unified approach must be taken to it. It is clear, too, that the only approach which can succeed is an inter-disciplinary one, with the several sides of the problem reflected in the represented expertise. The breadth of the approach to the problem must match the breadth of the problem itself.

### Problems and Needs

The attack on narcotics, drug, and alcohol abuse should be three-pronged, focussing on prevention, enforcement, and the handling of abusers. The only member of this trio which could now be called systematic is that of enforcement. There is no systematization in prevention worthy of that designation, and not much more in the handling of abusers.

#### Enforcement

The enforcement of laws dealing with illegal use of these substances calls for policemen specially trained in this work, and a regional approach to enforcement which recognizes the ease with which these substances and their purveyors cross political boundaries. Local departments of police practice a good deal of such coordination, but are in need of additional equipment to make a regional approach more effective. Such coordinative arrangements are typically made by common consent rather than binding legal contract.





In two notable instances, multi-jurisdictional arrangements have been developed for working on the problems of drugs and narcotic use. In Marin County the Board of Supervisors has established a separate County-wide agency to handle enforcement problems, and the County Board of Education handles educational aspects of the prevention work. In southern Alameda County, police departments in several communities have an effective working arrangement for mutual help in enforcement, and they are pleased with the results. These two are cited as illustrative rather than exhaustive of such instances, but show somewhat different approaches to enforcement problems.

Due to the rapid growth of abuse of mind-altering substances, many of the resources of local enforcement bodies, both in equipment and in personnel, are presently inadequate. For example, present crime labs were established to serve a specified need before the drug problem became so widespread; yet today the bulk of their work is reportedly being done on drugs. It is not surprising that they are now so inadequate as to constitute a serious impediment to enforcement.

### Prevention

Work on prevention, as indicated earlier, can be characterized as sporadic and haphazard. Education at every level offers a most promising means for prevention. Probably the most significant local instance of tackling prevention through education is taking place in Marin County, as mentioned above. This program recognizes that police departments are specialists in enforcement, not in education. Hence, the responsibility for education in drug abuse in Marin County has been given to the specialists in education, the County Department of Education.

Attempts at education on drug abuse, however, amount to localized rather than regionalized attempts to meet the problem. One of the reasons for this is rather clear: the amount of solidly verifiable information on the question of drug usage is much too small, particularly in the critical area of the social and psychological problems involved. Given this condition, it is difficult to put together an educational program of true merit.



Several other roadblocks stand in the way of effective education. First, the users of mind-altering substances have empirical evidence of their effects, and those who would teach them in this subject do not. The users and potential users are thus inclined to reject the work of the experienced as lacking authority. Second, as mentioned earlier, there is a lack of verifiable knowledge to teach in the first place. Third, so much misinformation has been circulated on this question in the past, some of it by official agencies, that real and potential users are honestly suspicious of the utterances of their elders, which they fear will be propagandistic rather than factual. What is clearly needed is a solid fund of knowledge on the subject -- developed through research when necessary and presented to users and potential users in a completely honest way -- and a well-developed program for spreading this knowledge widely throughout the Bay Area.

#### Processing of Abusers

The processing of abusers presents a pattern full of frustrations. As noted earlier, many hospitals simply will not admit drug abusers for treatment. This causes not only problems of health, but also of the disposition of the case. The policeman, for example, cannot release the person in an acute stage of disability from drug abuse simply because the hospital will not accept him. The policeman's only option is often to put the person in jail as a means of protecting the community, and, hopefully giving some protection to the abuser. But the jailing of what is primarily a health problem is, at best, unwise public policy.

Problems of drug abuse vary greatly in their severity and the type of treatment implied. Optimally, we should have a range of facilities, both for physical and for psycho-social handling of such people. The un-wiseness of confining the common drunk to jail is now generally understood, and is more readily seen for the 'marijuana smoker. The same can be said for putting either in a state hospital. Confinement to institutions often has harmful side effects unrelated to the reasons for the person's being there, and generates still other problems. A range of options should be available to the official making first contact with a case of abuse, so that the abuser could be placed in that facility best suited to his condition. These should range from confinement in a security hospital facility for those



who could not be treated any other way (the narcotic addict, for example), to out-patient treatment on as localized a basis as possible for the case of minimal severity.

### Primary Goals

An overall goal is the development, in the nine-county Bay Area, of an awareness of the true breadth of this problem, and a commitment to its solution which runs deep enough to accomplish the tasks necessary for solving it. This obviously involves educational efforts in what we do know, research into what we don't know, enforcement of laws, and the necessary work with users to help them lead satisfying and useful lives.

The objectives are to divide the problem operationally into the elements of prevention, enforcement, and the handling of abusers, and to have a coordinative body which will oversee many of the efforts expended in bringing this about. This coordinative body should be interdisciplinary in character, so that the several aspects of the problem will be represented. In particular, expertness in all three of the designated areas will be present on the coordinating body. This group will attempt to direct various efforts, particularly those arising through the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, in keeping with the overall plan.

### Planning

It is emphasized that adequate time has not been available for the development of a plan which could be reckoned as complete. Thus a basic concern is that further time be allowed for development of such a plan. There is much that must be done, and the doing must be carefully planned. Therefore, further planning is appropriate during the early stages of the action program. It is proposed that the Task Force on Narcotic, Drug and Alcoholic Abuse become the coordinating group which will oversee the various efforts believed to be essential in dealing with the problem.

The function of the coordinating group would not be merely to clear action proposals for conformance to an overall plan, but also to encourage proposals which would so conform, and in general pursue an activist course in seeing that the needed work is done. Stringencies of time have not permitted the working out of the functions in detail,





but the responsibilities would include:

Identify needed research, both in the biological and chemical, and in the psycho-social aspects of use of mind-altering substances.

Determine types of needed facilities for processing abusers, and encourage their establishment.

Promote an educational program for instruction of policemen in non-enforcement aspects of the problem; instruction of non-enforcement people in the problems of enforcement; and, instruction of educators in problems of enforcement and the handling of abusers. In this connection, policemen should be included as observers in therapy sessions with abusers, doctors and psychologists, and educators should occasionally accompany policemen in their work of enforcement.

### Enforcement

The need for a regional approach to enforcement problems already has been stressed. Even with close cooperation between enforcement agencies, however, there are technical problems which make effective cooperation difficult. This is the fact that the radios used by different enforcement agencies are not compatible -- not on the same frequency -- which would make possible the instantaneous communication between jurisdictions which effective enforcement requires. The enormous increase of use of mind-altering substances and of arrests (in the nine-county Bay Area the arrests rose from 3,500 in 1965 to 10,000 in 1968), underscores the magnitude of the problem. Therefore, the immediate purchase of 82 compatible units of handi-talki radios has been proposed. For use in enforcement of narcotic and drug laws this would make comparatively easy the immediate communication between enforcement jurisdictions when continuous surveillance is needed. The figure of 82 is arrived at by allotting three units to each of the nine counties, for a total of 27 and an additional one for each 80,000 population, or 55 more for the entire Bay Area. The total cost of these units would be in the neighborhood of \$75,400.

### Laboratory Facilities

At present, four of the nine counties in this area (Marin, Sonoma, Napa, and Solano) are without immediately available laboratory services, and the laboratories in the other counties (and the one for the State Bureau of



Narcotic Enforcement in San Francisco) are seriously overworked. All these laboratories are intended for general criminalistic work, but two-thirds of their work is given over to analyses of drugs and narcotics.

Present laboratories thus are in urgent need of expansion. It is estimated that establishment of a new laboratory would cost around \$50,000. This does not include the salaries for technicians who are needed; but construction of the laboratory could be accomplished with funds available for the current fiscal year, and staffing could be accomplished in the next year.

The three goals proposed by the Task Force on Narcotic, Drug, and Alcohol Abuse for the current year, then, are the establishment of the Task Force as a coordinating group to oversee the needed work in prevention, enforcement, and handling of drug abusers; the immediate purchase and use of 82 handi-talkie radios; and the establishment of one laboratory in which analyses of mind-altering substances could be made.



## IX. RIOTS AND DISORDERS

Within Region V, riots and disorders have created one of the most dangerous and potentially disastrous situations the region has ever faced. The disturbances separate roughly into several categories: racial, academic, labor union and political. These categories appear to merge after the disturbances have been under way for some time, as support for one set of protagonists appears from other groups. Currently, for example, there is massive student participation in labor picket-line disorders, and labor organizations backing student protests with both oral and physical support. Mutual support is becoming almost automatic among many groups.

### Existing System for Control of Disorders

In the past, riots and disorders were considered local problems and were generally handled by the local policing forces, with a rare use of the National Guard. More recently, however, the restoration and maintenance of order have often been beyond the resources of a single community. As a result, a mutual aid pact based on the State of California Disaster Act has been developed for use by the various communities. Under this plan a jurisdiction may call upon other signatories to the pact to furnish aid and assistance from their police, fire, or other departments, after its own resources are deemed insufficient to combat a disorder. The mutual aid pact has helped, but it has not been able to solve all the problems, and it has created some new ones. However, implementation of these pacts has been the only means of containing some situations with limited local resources. Under the mutual aid pact, the jurisdiction in which the disorder occurs assumes control of personnel and equipment provided by other jurisdictions without reimbursement from any source. Recently, unprecedented demands have restricted the capacity and willingness of some signatories to respond.



## Problems and Needs

For purposes of analysis, riots and disorders have been divided into pre-hostility, hostility and post-hostility phases.

### Pre-Hostility

In the pre-hostility phase, the concern is to prevent a riot or disorder from developing. The root causes of riots and disorders are set deep within our society, and until these are discovered and alleviated law enforcement agencies will be called upon to maintain order. However, there are some short-term programs that should be considered. The following suggestions can be incorporated into the education and community relations programs developed by the Law Enforcement Task Force.

School District Plan. Educational programs should be introduced into the public schools regarding the laws relating to riots and disturbances; the economic and social penalties attached thereto; youth's stake in the orderly evolution of social, economic, and educational reforms; and the responsibility of youth to become involved in these changes, and to keep that involvement within a legal framework.

Police Community Relations. It is recognized that continuing contacts with community groups are of value in learning of situations that might grow into a riot or disorder, and in opening avenues of discussion that might avert a confrontation. Community relations programs should be undertaken to further such communications.

### Hostility

Mutual Aid. There are many weaknesses in the present Mutual Aid concept that inhibit its effectiveness:

1. Duty hours during major disturbances are too long, this produces physical and mental fatigue that in turn affects the judgment and self-control of police personnel.
2. Undue burdens may be placed on smaller communities who provide aid but rarely request it.
3. Significant differences in training and equipment among the various jurisdictions create a formidable problem to the commander who must integrate the various units into a cohesive force.





4. The selection of police personnel to be sent to the riot area by each department is often on an "availability" basis, rather than a result of selecting those most qualified for such work.

5. State and Federal financial assistance should be sought in restoring and maintaining order, as disorders are not exclusively a matter of local concern.

6. The use of Mutual Aid forces in some instances has gone beyond meeting an emergency need and now involves preventive policing.

7. Morale in some departments is adversely affected by the unevenness of compensation for officers on riot duty.

Weapons. There are in existence many modern crowd-control devices which, if supplied and used, would reduce injuries and deaths, and are more effective than those presently supplied.

Equipment. Many departments are either inadequately equipped with riot equipment, or not equipped at all; an equally serious problem is lack of equipment standardization.

Training. Many police agencies have had little or not training in specialized riot control techniques; some officers have little or no training in the rudimentary use of the police baton; because of differing levels and types of training, there is little common ground for concerted action.

#### Post-Hostility

There has not been sufficient research following civil disturbances to determine exactly what happened, to identify patterns, or to permit informed judgments concerning future actions and development of better methods.

#### Primary Goals

The present approach to controlling major riots and civil disorders within the Bay Area clearly reflects some serious inadequacies and inequities. The Mutual Aid principle upon which the present system is based is fundamentally sound. However, additional and improved planning, modification, and coordination are essential if maximum benefit is to be obtained from the resources made available. Such planning and coordination, if it is to serve that purpose, should be on a regional basis.



As indicated in the report of the Task Force on Riots and Disorders, comprehensive, careful, and detailed planning must occur well in advance of civil disorder to reduce the number of decisions that must otherwise be made under emergency conditions.

Weak links in the Mutual Aid "chain" must be strengthened -- also through mutual assistance. This can be accomplished through cooperative training, the adoption of uniform tactics and equipment standards, and through pooling of specialized riot control resources. The Task Force proposes the establishment of a regional corps comprised of components from individual jurisdictions, and organized on a county-by-county basis. The corps would be administered by a regional commission. Complete details of the organization proposed are contained in the body of the Task Force report.



The following chapters, X, XI and XII, represent the Regional Advisory Board's recommendations for an initial study program to undertake comprehensive regional criminal justice planning.





X. A CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING PROGRAM  
FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION

The administration of justice generally can be visualized as occurring on a continuum with several vital decision points which include the following:

1. The victim or an observer of the offense must decide whether or not to report the matter to a law enforcement agency;
2. The law enforcement agency investigates and decides whether to file a charge or drop the case;
3. Following filing of the charge, the prosecutor (district, county, or city attorney) must analyze the evidence filed and decide whether to process the case or to dismiss it;
4. The court must then decide whether the individual should be required to post bond pending trial;
5. Through the trial process, the court decides the matter of guilt or innocence;
6. After a determination of guilt, the court must decide the sentence to be imposed; and
7. Finally, within the limits posed by statutes, the prison, probation, or other correctional official must determine the length of incarceration or supervision.

The decisions which are made at each of these points are inter-related, and a change in decision-making at any one point in the process affects the entire system. If the public is diligent in reporting crime, the need for police services is increased. If the police press charges on everyone arrested, the need for prosecuting attorneys, defense attorneys and court personnel is increased. If the district attorney or the juvenile court does no screening and takes every case to court, the need for judicial and other court personnel is increased. If the court sentences everyone found guilty to imprisonment, prison facilities are in great need. If,



conversely, the court places a great percentage of the convicted on probation rather than in prison, the need for probation services increases and the need for prison services decreases. Similarly, if prisoners are retained in the institution until their discharge dates, the need for parole services is limited and the need for prison facilities is greatly increased.

The work program outlined on the following pages has as its objectives: (1) the development of long-range planning as a continuing function of law enforcement and criminal justice to the end that all interrelated components of this system might work in full harmony to achieve the overriding goal of crime reduction and control; and (2) the improvement, through implementation of plans, of the existing law enforcement and criminal justice system to make it work more effectively.

As stated above, the administration of justice occurs on a continuum with several crucial decision points that determine the efficiency of the system. Similarly, it is well understood that in a broad sense societal conditions, physical environment, deviant behavior and crime, also, occur in a somewhat causative sequence.

Therefore, in addition to improving the procedural and technical aspects of law enforcement, it is of utmost urgency that critical in-depth inquiry be made of the interrelationships of various disciplines involved in the criminal justice system, and that extensive efforts be made to increase communications among them. Within that context, a desirable first step in discovering how these needs can best be met is to examine programmatic and organizational patterns that exist for providing services that are, or should be, supportive to law enforcement.



The following chapter describes the proposal for an initial planning program for Region V. It includes a description of planning actions required during the first year of comprehensive plan development and summarizations of task force reports, together with digests of illustrative action proposals. This program should be accepted as a mere beginning. It is impossible to design the final work in law enforcement planning. New techniques are developed daily and, hopefully, much more will be learned about the causes of crime. As new knowledge is developed, planning should be extended to utilize it.

Individual task force reports are appended to this plan and are hereby incorporated, by reference, in support of the Region's application for planning and action grant funds as authorized and available in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.



XI. AN INDEX OF PLANNING PROJECTS





## Project 1

## INVENTORY AND DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY

Study Outline

Because of the very large number of agencies comprising the law enforcement and criminal justice system in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area and because of major gaps in recorded information concerning work load and work load analysis, an initial project will be required to compile a data base covering a sufficient time span to serve as a basis for projections on which planning efforts can proceed.

Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Population - an analysis of census and related data for each county with analysis by census tract for densely populated areas showing:
  - a. population characteristics including race, sex and age, emphasizing juvenile age (10-17 boys and 10-18 girls)
  - b. socio-cultural data including school enrollment, educational level, unsound housing, unemployment, and income.
2. Delinquency and Crime
  - a. offenses reported to the police (excluding traffic)
  - b. analysis by geographic location of selected reported offenses.
3. Law Enforcement Activity
  - a. arrests by type of offense and by law enforcement agency making the arrest
  - b. arrest distribution by type of offense, place of residence of persons arrested, race, sex, and age
  - c. disposition of arrests by type of offense.
4. Prosecution Activity by County
  - a. cases pending at beginning of year



- b. cases received
  - c. cases dismissed
    - (1) by prosecutor
    - (2) by grand jury
  - d. negotiated guilty pleas
  - e. cases tried
    - (1) convicted
    - (2) dismissed
    - (3) not guilty
    - (4) not processed
  - f. cases pending at end of year
  - g. number of jury trials
  - h. writs of error filed
    - (1) successful
    - (2) unsuccessful
5. Court Activity by County and Type of Court
- a. cases pending at beginning of year
  - b. cases heard
    - (1) with jury
    - (2) without jury
      - (a) guilty pleas
      - (b) not-guilty pleas
  - c. disposition of cases
    - (1) dismissed
    - (2) not processed
    - (3) not guilty
    - (4) sentenced
      - (a) fine
      - (b) probation
      - (c) fine and probation
      - (d) imprisonment
      - (e) fine and imprisonment
      - (f) committed to Youth Authority
      - (g) suspended sentence
      - (h) other
  - d. cases pending at end of year.
6. Defense Activity by County and Type of Court



- a. defendants represented by private counsel
  - b. defendants represented by court-appointed attorney; and
  - c. defendants not represented by counsel.
7. Bail and Bond Activity by County and Type of Court
- a. released on personal recognizance
    - (1) appeared
    - (2) failed to appear
  - b. released on bail bond
    - (1) appeared
    - (2) failed to appear; and
  - c. denied bail.
8. Adult Imprisonment by Institution
- a. adult population at beginning of year
  - b. number received by age and sex
    - (1) for detention pending trial
      - (a) total man-days served awaiting trial
      - (b) average stay awaiting trial
    - (2) to serve sentence (or in lieu of fine)
      - (a) total man-days serving sentence
      - (b) average stay serving sentence
  - c. number released
    - (1) discharged
    - (2) transferred to other institution
      - (a) county
      - (b) California Youth Authority
      - (c) Mental Health Facility
      - (d) Department of Corrections
      - (e) other
  - d. adult population at end of year.
9. Juvenile Detention or Institutionalization by Place (jail, detention home, and other)
- a. number detained at beginning of year
  - b. number received by age and sex
    - (1) total man-days of retention
    - (2) average stay
  - c. number released





- (1) released to parent or guardian
- (2) transferred to other institution
  - (a) California Youth Authority
  - (b) California Department of Corrections
  - (c) Mental Health Facility
  - (d) other

d. number detained at end of year.

10. Adult and Juvenile Probation Services by Agency

a. background reports prepared

- (1) for court
- (2) for others

b. number on probation at beginning of year

c. new persons received on probation

d. disposition

- (1) released
- (2) transferred to another probation service
- (3) institutionalized
  - (a) for probation violation
  - (b) for new offense
- (4) other

e. number on probation at end of year

f. number of probation officers

g. average caseload.

11. Adult Parole and Juvenile Aftercare by Agency

a. number under supervision at beginning of year

b. number received

c. disposition

- (1) released
- (2) transferred to another parole or aftercare service
- (3) institutionalized
  - (a) for violation of parole or aftercare
  - (b) for new offense
- (4) other

d. number under supervision at end of year

e. number of parole or aftercare officers

f. average caseload.

12. Services and Facilities - in the process of collecting the



above data, a complete inventory should be prepared of all agencies and institutions, public and private, which constitute or contribute to the law enforcement and criminal justice system in the nine counties comprising the San Francisco Bay Area. For each agency or facility the following information should be obtained:

- a. jurisdiction (functional and geographic), including legislative authority, if any
- b. policies, programs and goals
- c. personnel
  - (1) professional
  - (2) nonprofessional and supporting
- d. size, type and capacity of physical facilities
- e. work load data
- f. annual and per unit costs
- g. source of financing
- h. relationship with other law enforcement and criminal justice agencies within and outside the San Francisco Bay Area region
- i. relations with other agencies.

#### Study Objectives

The objectives of this study should be: (1) a report suitable for distribution to Bay Area governments and appropriate state and federal agencies; and (2) a method for updating the planning data in the report at least annually.

Costs and time estimates assume the continuing cooperation and assistance of area law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. Much of the required data can be obtained and made available for planning purposes within three to twelve months, while some of it will have to be developed from source documents and other data will have to be collected for the first time, requiring 12 to 24 months for completion of the study.



## Project 2

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### Study Outline

Police radio, teletype and telephonic communications are so interwoven that they should be considered concurrently. There is no effective regional interagency radio system in existence. There is some monitoring of radios operated by adjacent departments. However, the existing facilities are not capable of supporting expanded areawide services. There is no doubt that communications will expand of necessity during the next few years; the growth should be orderly and should be integrated with other components of the overall information system.

Teletype communications are used extensively for communications among agencies. They provide a valuable service but are not sufficient by themselves.

#### Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Examination and analysis of the existing law enforcement and related communications systems in the region, including all police radio, telephone, teletype, and computer systems
2. Analysis and projection of regional communications needs based on sampling of data to determine volume of messages, peak hour loads, etc.
3. Development of specific recommendations for voice communications and teletype systems designed to meet present and prospective police needs
4. Statement of the interrelationships of the voice and teletype communications networks with area records systems and computer systems.

#### Study Objectives

The objectives of this study should be a report for distribution to



all law enforcement agencies in the area, describing the existing communications systems and recommending improvements where needed. The study should be conducted in close coordination with studies of the records systems and computer utilization.





## Project 3

## COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Study Outline

The San Francisco Bay Area has experienced some major incidents to indicate varying degrees of distrust and failure to cooperate with law enforcement agencies among some elements of the population. Recent riots and civil disorders are notable examples. The San Francisco Bay Area should benefit from its own experiences and those of others by planning now for necessary action to ensure good police-community relations.

Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Analysis of existing police-community relations programs of area law enforcement agencies
2. Development of recommended goals for a police-community relations program
3. Development of a set of recommended guidelines suitable for use by area law enforcement agencies desiring to establish a formalized police-community relations program
4. Development of community relations training programs for
  - (a) specialists in police-community relations
  - (b) all other police personnel.

Study Objectives

At the conclusion of this project, a report should be made available to all law enforcement agencies, setting forth suggested goals and guidelines for operation of a police-community relations program and summarizing related training needs. A detailed training program should be prepared for the use of the Police Training Facilities.



## Project 4

### COMPUTER UTILIZATION

#### Study Outline

Dramatic examples of utilization of computers by police departments may be found in the Bay Area. Since a major portion of every police department budget is expended for manpower, any process or system which promises more effective utilization of this resource should be evaluated thoroughly and should be utilized wherever its merits are proved. A computer cannot make decisions on the assignment of police resources. However, it can provide the decision-maker with comparisons and analyses of the considerable amount of data that should be considered in making manpower and equipment assignments.

The utilization of computers in the law enforcement and criminal justice field is relatively new. Yet, it has already demonstrated effectiveness as a record-keeping device, as a device for instantaneous communication of recorded data, and as a device for aiding decision-makers in the utilization of scarce resources in police departments, courts and other criminal justice agencies. It is probable that its potential has only begun to be tapped.

#### Study Requirements

This project should proceed in concert with, and be based in part upon, the projects dealing with communications and records, and should, specifically, include the following:

1. Examination of existing and proposed records, communications and computer systems
2. Collection and examination of quantitative data concerning volume of activity, amount of data in each file, the frequency of input into the files and estimated file inquiry frequencies



3. Sampling of data not readily available to determine volume, such as sampling daily message volumes and peak-hour message loads, file volumes and report frequencies
4. Analysis of data, evaluation of system objectives and design of system concepts
5. Design of a proposed system or systems
6. Analysis of financial feasibility of the proposed system or systems.

#### Study Objectives

The objectives of this project would be a report containing a full technical discussion of the proposed system and a complete statement of how it would perform. The system or systems and each subsystem would be described, complete with illustrations identifying functions that would be performed. In addition, the report should provide the following:

1. A complete planning schedule showing time requirements of detailed design and implementation of each of the subsystems
2. Manpower requirements and needs for developing and operating such a system
3. A detailed equipment requirement schedule showing the type of equipment that would be required as each portion of the system is developed and integrated into the total system
4. A complete budgetary forecast for a five-year period showing the financial requirements for the development of the overall system
5. An economic analysis applying generally accepted cost effectiveness measures to describe the economic effect of this system.

If this type of project will be undertaken in the immediate future by the State on a statewide basis with full consideration of local and regional requirements, this project can be limited to the consultant and advisory committee work required to ensure that local and regional needs are met.





## Project 5

### PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, AND EDUCATION

#### Study Outline

Police chiefs, probation officers and district and county attorneys agree that one of their principal problems is obtaining, training, and retaining competent personnel. Formal personnel or civil service systems are nonexistent for some agencies. Police departments usually operate under their own individualized civil service systems. Almost universally, police chiefs complain that civil service and personnel systems as presently constituted do not permit the best in current personnel practices.

The region should achieve better cooperation in the provision of police personnel training through development of regional training resources. These resources could be designed to permit full or partial training of several criminal justice disciplines, such as prosecuting attorneys, probation officers and other criminal justice personnel. In many instances the only training available to a new employee in these categories is a brief amount of time spent observing or assisting a more experienced officer.

Law enforcement and criminal justice education has received far less attention in the area than has skill-oriented training. Comprehensive programs will be required if renovation of the law enforcement and criminal justice system is to proceed as needed.

#### Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Analysis of existing state laws, constitutional provisions and local ordinances and regulations governing personnel administration in law enforcement and criminal justice agencies
2. Determination of desirable standards for personnel administration following extensive interviews with affected local officials and review of recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice



and other state and national authorities. Specific study should be given to the possibility of providing more than one entry level and lateral transfer for law enforcement agencies, with qualification for each level based on education, training, and experience

3. Inventory of formalized training available in the area for law enforcement and criminal justice personnel, an analysis of training needs of present and projected personnel, and development of a regional training program designed to use all available facilities to meet those needs
4. Analysis of changing trends and indicated needs for increased professional diversification of police, probation officers and other employees of the criminal justice system, and a projection of educational needs for law enforcement and criminal justice personnel beyond that now offered by training academies and area colleges and universities
5. A program for implementing the findings and recommendations developed.

#### Study Objectives

The report resulting from this study should have three sections as follows: (1) personnel administration; (2) training; and (3) education.

Two sets of conclusions should be drawn in the section on personnel administration. The first of these should be presented in the form of model statutes, ordinances and personnel regulations designed to foster improved professional perspectives in law enforcement agencies and probation and prosecution offices. The second major set of conclusions should deal with ways that the local governments in the San Francisco Bay Area can help solve some of their problems in the field of personnel administration through cooperative action. It might be possible, for example, to develop uniform personnel standards and operate joint recruiting, selection, and other programs. Such a system might serve to reduce the existing gap between authorized and filled positions, and it should result in a better screening and selection process.

The training and education sections should constitute a plan for meeting all of the law enforcement and criminal justice training and edu-



cation needs in the San Francisco Bay Area, using or developing, as necessary, training academies and educational institutions located in the area. This program should make specific provision for meeting the needs in the fields of adult and juvenile probation, parole, and prosecution as well as continuing and improving established programs in law enforcement.

Recognizing the increasing demands placed upon criminal justice agencies, and the need for a higher degree and for different emphases of professionalization, the study should project needs for academic training leading to both bachelor and graduate degrees.



## Project 6

### RECORDS MANAGEMENT

#### Study Outline

Records are needed: (1) to provide information for communication within and among agencies and departments so that correctional and law enforcement objectives can be effectively accomplished; (2) to assist with supervision and control of personnel by measuring their accomplishment; (3) to inform the public; and (4) to provide information for intelligent decisions in matching governmental resources to community needs.

Records maintained by judicial, enforcement, and correctional agencies vary greatly in quality and content. There are wide gaps in information available to government agencies concerned with helping people solve problems. To this extent there is a need to improve interagency communications and information resources.

#### Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Examination of the present records and information systems in the regional law enforcement, prosecution, court, and correctional agencies;
2. Examination of law enforcement and criminal justice problems, manpower, material resources, and requirements for establishment of effective records;
3. Identification of records information needed in each type of agency for the effective operation of the criminal justice system and for interagency communications;
4. Specific recommendations for the establishment of needed records; and
5. Specific recommendations for reporting and disseminating records information in order to make it effective in attaining the goals of criminal justice system.





### Study Objectives

The objective of this phase of the criminal justice planning program should be a report outlining the overall system of recorded information needed for effective, coordinated operation of criminal justice and appropriate social service agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area. It should contain appropriate subsections detailing the records to be maintained by each type of agency and outlining the record-keeping procedures required. The work on this study should be conducted in close coordination with studies dealing with communications and computer utilization.



PROJECT 7  
INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION

Study Outline

Cooperative arrangements to exchange intelligence information routinely appear to be one way of placing enforcement agencies in a more favorable position to cope with the forces of organized crime.

Criminal intelligence is a painstaking job of collecting specialized information, some of which would not appear in the routine records of police agencies. Special attention and study need to be given to this activity and the interrelationships among various intelligence units operated within the region.

Study Requirements

This study should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Review of the present criminal intelligence system based on an analysis of records and interviews with personnel throughout the area who operate criminal intelligence units;
2. Analysis of criminal intelligence needs, with specific attention to needs growing out of the known or suspected activities of organized crime; and
3. Development of recommendations for meeting regional intelligence needs.

Study Objectives

A report should be prepared giving the findings of the study and setting forth recommendations. An analysis of alternative ways of meeting the regional needs for criminal intelligence should be included along with a statement of costs and methods of financing.



PROJECT 8  
LABORATORY SERVICES

Study Outline

Scientific evidence, search, collection and examination services are essential to effective law enforcement and agencies must increasingly depend upon scientific technology rather than traditional investigative methods. Competent technicians and good equipment are essential to the success of any laboratory evaluation. A good laboratory operation is beyond the means of many agencies because of the high cost. This leaves some critical problems unsolved.

Study Requirements

This study should include the following:

1. Interview with key criminal and narcotics investigation personnel throughout the region for the purpose of establishing the extent of need for laboratory facilities and personnel;
2. Examination of present laboratory facilities and interviews with laboratory personnel for the purpose of determining where gaps exist in facilities and services;
3. Development of specific recommendations for establishing an effective system to aid area enforcement agencies in gathering evidence and analyzing it in accordance with the best scientific laboratory analysis principles.

Study Objectives

The objective of this study should be a report for distribution to area criminal justice agencies, outlining presently available laboratory facilities and setting forth in detail a proposal for making available the best scientific laboratory analysis services for those agencies.





PROJECT 9  
JUVENILE COURTS AND CORRECTIONS

Study Outline

Rehabilitative treatment techniques are more widely recognized and utilized in the San Francisco Bay Area for correction of juvenile offenders than for adults. Each county in California is required by state law to have a juvenile court. In some counties the court handles juvenile matters in addition to a regular docket of other cases, but in some counties such courts deal exclusively with juvenile matters.

Recent studies indicate that a majority of youthful offenders under 20 are likely to commit new crimes within a few years after their release from custody. Therefore, major effort toward rehabilitating these young offenders holds the possibility of achieving a significant reduction in crime rates.

Study Requirements

This study should include the following:

1. Analysis of pretrial services for juvenile offenders provided by the police, juvenile court and other public or private agencies, including background reports, family and individual counseling and psychiatric care, and determination of the need for such services.
2. Inventory of physical facilities utilized throughout the area for juvenile detention pending court action, analysis of utilization of such facilities, and determination of the type and quantity of facilities needed;
3. Inventory of physical facilities utilized throughout the area for institutionalization of juvenile offenders, analysis of the utilization of such facilities, and determination of the type and quantity of facilities needed; and
4. Analysis of juvenile probation services and determination of juvenile probation needs.



### Study Objectives

The objective of this study should be a report describing juvenile courts and locally administered juvenile corrections activity in the nine-county region and setting forth recommendations for provision of such services throughout the region in such a way as to further the overall crime control and crime prevention goals of the area's criminal justice system. The report should contain a proposed plan for the improvement of juvenile court and correctional services in the region, including a projection of needs for facilities and personnel.



## Project 10

### DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

#### Study Outline

Theories disagree concerning factors believed to influence an individual toward crime. There is general agreement among the theorists, however, that the most hopeful time to divert a potential delinquent from a life of crime to a life as a productive member of society is during the teen or preteen years. The criminal justice planning program, therefore, should include a study project to evaluate and determine the need for programs designed to prevent delinquency.

#### Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Inventory and analysis of programs of area school systems designed to: (a) identify potential dropouts, (b) provide counsel for them, and (c) keep them in school until they have been provided the necessary qualifications to enter college or qualify for productive employment;
2. Inventory and analysis of other public and private agencies which devote resources toward the solution of juvenile and family problems. This category would include but not be limited to the following: juvenile courts, probation agencies and institutions (the preceding project should meet this need), child welfare agencies, child day-care centers, public recreation programs, mental health agencies, family counseling agencies and juvenile divisions of law enforcement agencies;
3. Study of pertinent recommendations of national and state associations concerned with education, welfare and mental health;
4. Development of a program for identifying potential delinquents
5. Development of a program to prevent delinquency, emphasizing work with groups identified as potential delinquents.

#### Study Objectives

The objective of this study would be a report for distribution to area governments and affected public and private agencies, containing specific recommendations for action, individually or collectively, designed to reduce the level of delinquency in the area.



## Project 11

## LOCALLY ADMINISTERED ADULT CORRECTIONS

Study Outline

An effectively operated correctional system can contribute to the control and prevention of crime, whereas an ill-equipped and improperly operated one can contribute to the incidence of crime.

The responsibility for correctional services for adults is split between the state government and the counties. The State assumes responsibility for incarceration of felony offenders sentenced to prison terms. Local governments are responsible for detention pending trial, incarceration of persons convicted of misdemeanors, and supervision of persons placed on probation regardless of the nature of the offense. In addition to the division of correctional responsibility between the state and local levels, local correctional administration is further divided among nine counties in the San Francisco Bay region.

A broadly stated goal of a correctional system is the reduction and prevention of crime. Since local governments have the first opportunity of rendering correctional services to the offender and since they are responsible for the only correctional services administered to the high percentage of first-time offenders who are more likely to be placed on probation or receive short sentences, the local governmental responsibility for crime prevention through correctional services is a key one.

Study Requirements

The study should include the following:

1. Analysis of practices and policies of the police and courts concerning pretrial detention, release on bail bond and release on recognizance, and comparison of the effects of these policies and practices with alternatives that have been developed and tried in other areas
2. Determination of the extent to which alcoholism affects the work





load of the correctional system, and analysis of alternative treatment methods for alcoholics

3. Determination of the extent of utilization of presentence investigations to aid judges in determining the type of correctional service indicated, and determination of the need for such services
4. Evaluation of adult probation services and determination of additional needs for such services
5. Analysis of correctional services and custodial care provided by city and county jails and county farms, and evaluation of the need for such services
6. Survey of city and county jail and county farm facilities, determination of the adequacy and need for such facilities and analysis of possible improvements through consolidation of them
7. Survey of other public and private agencies which provide health, welfare, employment, training, and educational services that support or complement correctional programs
8. Development of a plan for correctional services including probation, detention facilities, other institutions, and correctional services to be provided for persons detained or imprisoned. The plan should include standards and criteria for facility design and geographic location, and should indicate the role of health, welfare, employment, training and educational agencies in the rehabilitation of offenders.

### Study Objectives

The objective of this phase of the criminal justice planning program should be a report setting forth the findings of the study and detailing a proposed plan for provision of all correctional services which are a local responsibility. The plan should include a method of organizing and administering the correctional services recommended and should project facility and personnel needs for a ten-year period.



## Project 12

## CONTINUING REGIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Study Outline

There is a need for more administrative and operational planning within each law enforcement and criminal justice agency. However, there is also a need for planning in this field at the regional level. The crime problems are not confined to city limits or county lines. They overlap, and when they do some regional presence is needed in order to develop a regional response.

Contingency plans are needed for mutual aid and sharing of manpower and equipment resources for dealing with emergencies such as riots, other manmade disorders, and natural disasters.

There is a need for continual study and planning concerning procedures and processes used for communication and cooperation among law enforcement agencies. Changes and improvements in these procedures will be needed as conditions change.

The routine operations of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies should be analyzed to determine where economies or improvements might be made through cooperation, for example, in the writing of equipment specifications and the purchasing and maintenance of equipment.

The inventory and demographic study proposed will probably indicate a need for further research and planning. For example, public education programs should be prepared and administered to inform the public of problems and identify ways that the public can improve the effectiveness of the criminal justice system in preventing crime and apprehending offenders.

Finally, the planning program outlined in this report cannot be complete. An active operating agency can never complete the planning



process. Planning studies outlined herein will suggest the need for still other studies. Changing conditions will create changing needs for planning efforts. A permanent planning staff is the most logical way of meeting this planning need.

Since this is a continuing planning activity, its contents cannot be precisely described. Initial planning studies, however, should include:

1. Analysis of existing mutual-aid agreements among law enforcement agencies and development of a model mutual-aid agreement form and a suggested pattern for mutual aid agreements or contracts throughout the region
2. Analysis of the capability of all area law enforcement agencies, fire departments and other public safety agencies for response to riots, other civil disorders, and natural disasters, and development of contingency plans for regional response where circumstances require it
3. Study of the costs and benefits to be achieved from standardizing police equipment specifications and purchasing selected items cooperatively
4. Other studies to be conducted as needed.

#### Study Objectives

Memorandum reports or more formal reports will be prepared and distributed for each significant planning project undertaken as a part of continuing planning. The results of other planning activities may be presented through reports to conferences of criminal justice personnel or through other means.



## XII. IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the planning program outlined in the preceding pages will require money, manpower, time, and continuation of the spirit of governmental cooperation that already exists in the San Francisco Bay region.

Estimated monetary requirements will be developed in appropriate detail as required, as will the total cost of the proposed program. The amount should be well within the resources available in the form of grants and local matching effort under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and such other sources as may be appropriate.

The California Council on Criminal Justice has indicated that it will allocate funds to the Association of Bay Area Governments and will rely on it for regional planning under the Omnibus Crime Control Act. Funds available from this source, with ten per cent local matching, should be adequate to finance the first and subsequent years of the proposed program.

It is suggested that manpower for the proposed program be provided through a permanent staff, plus contractual and "in kind" services. The staff should consist of at least four professional positions plus necessary support personnel. (Ideally, the professional staff should have academic degrees in the social sciences, and experience in one or more phases of the criminal justice system as appropriate.) Position descriptions will be developed on the basis of project needs.

The time schedule shown in the accompanying chart anticipates continued availability of planning funds under the Omnibus Crime Control Bill.

The final ingredient needed to implement this program is a spirit of governmental cooperation. Fortunately, such a spirit already exists in





the San Francisco Bay region, and a pattern for maintaining it has been firmly established. The Association of Bay Area Governments has been assisted by two types of "boards" to guide it in program development and administration: 1) a Regional Criminal Justice Advisory Board for policy development, composed of members from criminal justice agencies, government, and citizens to advise the Association's Executive Committee regarding regional goals; and 2) Task Forces composed of technically qualified people to determine local and regional needs, and develop plans and recommendations in broad functional areas for advisory board consideration.

Since this pattern has been successfully used to date, it is suggested that the Regional Advisory Board continue as a policy development body in the broad field of criminal justice and be assigned the task of reviewing this proposed planning program and the Association's Executive Board concerning it, both prior to and during implementation.

The membership of the Board should be enlarged to achieve broader representation (a membership of 40 is suggested); the enlarged Board should assume the responsibilities of the task forces through appointment of standing committees from its membership (suggested minimum size of five members each); standing committees should implement established policy, screen grant applications, and appoint technical advisory committees as needed in connection with planning studies.



# CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

OTHER STATE  
PLANNING REGIONS

REGION V  
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA  
GOVERNMENTS

REGIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
ADVISORY BOARD

REPRESENTATIVES OF:  
Local Government  
Criminal Justice System  
and the Community at Large

STANDING COMMITTEES

Grant Application Review  
Policy Implementation

PROJECT COORDINATION

SERVICES TO:  
Regional Advisory Board  
Standing Committees  
Local Government Jurisdictions  
Regional Law Enforcement Agencies

TYPES OF SERVICES:  
Administrative Support  
Consulting Services  
Research  
Study Design  
Grant Application Processing  
Other Services as Required

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

ILLUSTRATIVE ORGANIZATION FOR  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING



## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A

### DIGEST OF TASK FORCE PROPOSALS

The digests of projects presented in this Appendix are to be considered illustrative of the types of projects and actions which may be undertaken. Inclusion of these in this report does not constitute specific endorsement of approval at this time.





## DIGEST OF PROPOSALS

### RIOTS AND DISORDERS

While the approach of the task force has been from the point of view of the police, riots and disorders directly affect every phase of the administration of justice, as well as a large number of public and private agencies which under normal conditions have little relationship to criminal justice. Because of this, while the following proposals deal basically with the problem as it touches law enforcement, research should not be limited to this approach.

#### Specific Proposals

##### First Year Proposals

1. A study of current and projected police personnel and equipment at the departmental, county, and regional levels.

Total Cost: \$1,400

2. A study of the quality and efficiency of equipment currently used, as well as a determination of types of equipment needed which are not now provided.

Total Cost: \$2,700

3. Identify and examine in depth prior disturbances, calling on local departments to assist in criticism of the methods used to handle them.

Total Cost: \$10,800

4. Develop a public school plan which will work with students and school personnel to prevent future disorders, as well as assisting the schools in the development of plans for handling those disorders which do materialize.

Total Cost: \$18,000



Second Year Proposals

1. Establishment of a Regional Police Corps on a county basis, trained to handle riots and disorders.

Total Cost: Unknown

2. Establishment of a testing laboratory to test equipment prior to its purchase by either the Regional Police Corps or local departments.

Total Cost: Unknown

Proposals Beyond the Second Year

1. Hiring of permanent personnel for administrative and supportive positions within the Regional Police Corps.

Total Cost: Unknown

2. Building a training academy for the Regional Police Corps.

Total Cost: Unknown



## DIGEST OF PROPOSALS

### JUDICIAL PROCESS

Following are proposals for research on a number of topics of concern to the members of the task force. While they are listed separately, they are not necessarily independent of each other in their effects upon the judicial process and the wider area of the entire criminal justice system. An example of this is the question of bail. Whether or not a defendant is released on bail will have an effect upon caseloads in court, on the population of the county jail, on opportunities to commit a second crime, and on the offender's ability to retain his job and thereby afford to employ an attorney.

#### Specific Requests

1. Mutual Aid Planning between Superior, Municipal, and Justice Courts to allow for the processing of cases within statutory periods during times that a court is faced with a sudden large increase in cases.  

Total Costs: \$4,700
2. Bay Area Judicial Conference would provide a forum for the discussion of common problems concerning the judicial process.  

Total Costs: \$2,900
3. Center for Judicial Studies -- an inter-disciplinary research organization which could work towards the solutions to long-range problems as well as sponsor a degree program in Judicial Administration.  

Total Costs: \$12,000
4. Plea Bargaining -- to formulate a plan which will legitimize the position that plea bargaining has in the judicial system.  

Total Costs: \$4,250
5. Bail -- to provide the courts with reliable information upon which judges can base decisions concerning own recognizance releases, bail setting, and bail reduction.  

Total Costs: \$80,450



6. Bail Schedules -- to provide a basis upon which bail schedules can be established.

Total Costs: \$5,500

7. Caseload Standards -- to provide a uniform caseload standard for all agencies of the judicial process.

Total Costs: \$17,500

8. Juror Selection -- to study current practices in order to develop new techniques and procedures for juror selection.

Total Costs: \$4,000

9. Data Storage and Retrieval System -- to provide a comprehensive plan for a computer system for use by all agencies of the judicial process.

Total Costs: \$4,250

10. Pre-Trial Hearings and Motions -- to develop a pre-trial procedure which would consolidate motions and related matters into a time sequence which would save time in court.

Total Costs: None given

11. Court Reporters vs. Recording Devices -- to determine if there are alternatives to the use of court reporters in lower courts.

Total Costs: \$1,150

12. Warrants -- to provide a plan whereby the number of outstanding warrants is reduced.

Total Costs: \$4,250





## DIGEST OF PROPOSALS

### CORRECTIONS

The task force report lists on a county-by-county basis many suggested programs without giving the precise details for proposals. Certain programs are mentioned several times and in various forms, for example, both the Sheriff's Department and probation in most counties need new or enlarged facilities. Again, both groups see the need for work furlough programs, and probation seeks and increase in the number of halfway houses in many areas. There is a strong feeling on the part of most agencies that more rehabilitative programs should be developed both inside and outside jail facilities. A final point of agreement is the need for a regional program to train professionals and sub-professionals in the field of corrections.

Following is a list of specific projects submitted by the task force, many of which overlap one another. It is felt that any project which is funded should be considered as a pilot project, with the results viewed as having statewide as well as regional implications.

#### Specific Requests

1. Project Inside-Out. Funds have been requested for the continuation of this project within San Quentin, and for developing similar programs in jail facilities within Region V as well as in state institutions in other regions. Inside-Out brings businessmen, law enforcement officials, representatives of labor and other community organizations into the institution where they work with the offender to change his image of himself in relation to society.
2. SATE -- Self-Concept Project. Funds would be used for a study of the impact of a self-help group on block prisoners. The study would examine the impact of a penal institution (San Quentin) upon the individual. It is thought that a sub-system within the larger penal system can work to combat the negative effects of the larger system.



3. Central Institute on New Careers. Funds are needed to develop a technical resources center for new careers which would use the offender as a correctional manpower resource. The specific objectives would be to provide or assist in staff development and training, as well as to train new careerists and to coordinate their use in correctional agencies.
4. EMPLEO Organization. EMLEO, a private organization, seeks to integrate back into the community ex-convicts of Mexican-American extraction. This will be a coordinated approach, working with both probation and parole agencies.
5. The American Friends Service Committee. AFSC would like to conduct a regional study of jail facilities to assist sheriffs in rehabilitative programs.
  - a. "Halfway-in Houses" which would take the place of incarceration rather than waiting for parolees to be released from prison.
  - b. Apartment complexes in marginal neighborhoods to replace the conventional halfway houses which are often resented by the residents of the community. This would allow for more concentrated therapeutic use of the staff and better integration of the parolee into the community.
  - c. SOREMO -- Would provide sheltered work situations to assist the ex-convict in developing work habits in surroundings where he can receive counseling and ease his adjustment back into society.
  - d. Student Parolee Project. Funds are requested to expand a project which has seen six ex-convicts admitted to San Francisco State College with admission requirements waived.

None of the above proposals were accompanied by a budget or a request for a specific amount of funds.

6. Community Residence would be conducted by the Contra Costa Probation Department to assist probationers without adequate resources; would strengthen current probation practices.

Net Cost -- 10 month operation: \$53,340



## DIGEST OF PROPOSALS

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

The task force felt that funding should be on a regional basis and should not be given for the enhancement of individual entities. The following is a list of recommendations for projects which meet regional needs. A number of grant requests submitted by various Region V agencies have been added.

#### Regional Recommendations

1. Establish on-going police-community relations by means of service training programs which would utilize all scientific technological aids.
2. Use non-police personnel in police training to teach classes in the social sciences and humanities.
3. Develop a juvenile program to involve the type of youth who is not normally attracted to organized activities.
4. Develop research and funding methods for improved police recruitment programs which will attract minority persons.
5. Develop adequate procedures for handling citizen complaints.
6. Develop departmental procedures to assure the use of discretion by officers in handling people and problems.
7. Develop programs to bring motorized patrolmen in closer contact with the public.
8. Involve the police in community planning.

#### Specific Requests

1. Countywide San Mateo Information System -- This is a request for a grant to be used in delineating the information needs of each law enforcement agency in the county, including descriptions of present practices, type of facilities and equipment needed, a pilot demonstration of the system, and a plan outline for implementing the proposed program, as well as presenting the findings of a cost justification analysis.

Total Cost: \$127,500  
(1 year)



2. Law Enforcement Information System (San Francisco) -- A Request for funds to develop a management and operations system consisting of nine major modules which will support numerous law enforcement agencies. The nine modules are: 1) field support, 2) defendant processing, 3) court operations, 4) command and control, 5) personnel management, 6) equipment and property, 7) management analysis, 8) program management, and 9) management planning. This system will develop ties with other operational systems already used by law enforcement (e.g., PIN, autostates, CLETS).

Total Cost: \$577,104  
(1969-70)

Total Cost: \$1,895,160  
(5 years)

3. Santa Clara County Law Enforcement Information System of Logic -- a request for funds to develop a system which will supply the information needs of the entire Santa Clara County Law Enforcement community. The functional operations at all levels of the administration of criminal justice are dealt with as a single system divided into two functional groups: 1) the person care information sub-system and 2) the management information sub-system.

Total Cost: Unknown

4. Resource Allocation System -- Hayward: a request for funds to develop and implement a computer program which will provide the most efficient use of existing resources through manpower allocation based on recent data.

Total Cost: \$57,000  
(1 year)

5. East Bay Regional Park District -- a request for an unspecified amount of funds to be used for an increase in staff of Park Rangers, to whom fall the responsibilities for law enforcement within the regional park district.

Total Cost: Unknown

6. Police Radio Communications Center -- Santa Rosa: A request for funds for a center which, in event of a disaster, will have police, fire, and public utilities dispatched from one communication room.

Total Cost: \$54,000

7. Total Microfilming of Police Records -- Berkeley: a request for funds which allow for the use of microfilm in order to save space, prevent the loss of cases and index cards, eliminate time spent searching for reports, and function as a pilot study for the benefit of other law enforcement agencies.

Total Cost: \$76,641





8. Police Service Representative -- Oakland: a request for funds to develop the position of police service officer, whose task would be to assume some of the more routine work of the regular officer as well as to perform police services which are not presently being accomplished. Because the work would be simpler and would require less training, the police service officer would not be expected to meet all the standards normally required of the regular police officer.

Total Cost: \$142,827  
(first year)



DIGEST OF PROPOSALS  
NARCOTICS, DRUG & ALCOHOL ABUSE

The task force feels that adequate time has not been available during the brief life of our task force for the development of a plan which could be reckoned as complete. We believe that, at best, we have made a significant beginning. The task force presents three proposals for the current year with the first project, a coordinating council, including among its work development of a long-range plan.

Proposals

1. Coordinating Council. Funds are requested for a council which would not only clear action proposals but would also encourage the development of proposals.

Total Cost: Not given

2. Improve Communications. Funds are requested for the purchase of handi-talkie radios which would assist in the coordination of efforts between law enforcement agencies enforcing narcotic and drug laws.

Total Cost: \$57,400

3. Crime Laboratory. Funds are requested for the development of a regional crime laboratory.

Total Cost: \$50,000



## DIGEST OF PROPOSALS

### ORGANIZED CRIME

The task force believes that the large number of local police departments compressed into the relatively small area of Region V necessitates a region-wide organization which would maintain records as well as combat organized crime. In order to coordinate efforts in the region, local police officers must be involved in the regional approach. Because of this, the task force submits the following proposal along with an alternative plan.

#### Proposal

A regional board, to preside over a field force made up of five special agents from the California Department of Justice and twenty officers from local enforcement agencies, shall be established. The 25 investigators will be divided into five teams and will have a store of vehicles, special equipment, and records to call upon.

Total Cost: \$750,000  
(1 year)

#### Alternative Proposal

The alternate plan involves the expansion of the Department of Justice organized crime unit, which will call on local officers to assist in investigations in their own localities.

Total Cost: Unknown



DIGEST OF PROPOSALS  
EDUCATION & TRAINING

In the area of education and training related to the administration of criminal justice, the problems remain to be defined in operational terms. The task force's initial effort necessitates the creation of supportive planning services to determine operational levels, responsibilities, and needs before any short term or long term expenditures are made on action programs. In order to develop these programs, the task force makes the following proposal.

Proposal

Center for Criminal Law and Justice

Funds are requested for the establishment of a center which will provide the nucleus for functions of policy making, ideational and informational input, review, etc. The center will also establish a number of inter-agency/inter-organizational linkages.

Total cost (1969-60) - \$312,172





DIGEST OF PROPOSALS  
JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Presented here are a series of projects arranged by priority. The list is in no way intended to limit the content or imaginative quality of any proposals which might be submitted. As many of the projects are short or medium term by nature, the task force also presents a suggestion for a long-range action program.

The following projects are submitted without an estimate of cost.

Priority group #1

Establish a Youth Service Bureau

Develop an action program for the fast return of truants to school

Study foster home legislation and practice

Demonstrate and evaluate the use of group homes

Develop means for early identification of offenders and appropriate methods of intervention

Develop plan for multi-use facility to serve as diagnostic center, child care center, group home for teenagers, evaluation and counseling center, day care and temporary residence center

Experiment with and evaluate the use of former offenders as resource people

Priority group #2

Establish and evaluate a school for delinquents and parents in minor offense matters similar to traffic school for traffic offenders

Priority group #3

Prepare an inventory of physical plant and resources in the region which bear on the problem of delinquency

Prepare an inventory of the formal and informal agencies used in the treatment and prevention of delinquency in the region



Make a determination of current methods of the measurement of results of delinquency control methods

Cooperate with efforts to establish regional data bank for specific information pertaining to delinquency control

Develop parallel specialized education for probation personnel and police officers

#### Priority group #4

Study and evaluate the current methods of selection of all official agency personnel who deal with delinquency prevention and control

#### Priority group #5

Prepare a recommendation for the legislature defining the degrees of culpability and separation of lesser degrees from formal procedure

#### Priority group #6

Prepare recommendations and assist with development of school curricula in the general field of citizenship and the law

Prepare material for region-wide instruction in leadership for lay leaders in community and other informal facilities concerned in the control of delinquency

#### Priority group #7

Study and recommend how the opportunity for juveniles to commit crimes might be reduced

Develop an effective plan for the use of the media in delinquency control

#### Priority #8

Study and evaluate the effect of recent legislative changes pertaining to juvenile case procedures and philosophies

### Specific Proposals

1. Youth Services Bureau, Pleasant Hill, a request for funds to develop a program which would bring the police and youth together under conditions which would foster understanding between the police and youth.

Total Costs                      -    \$32,830



2. Juvenile Detention Facilities, Fremont

Total Costs - unknown

3. Delinquency Prevention Division, Richmond

Total Costs - unknown

4. Weekend Training Program, Contra Costa County: a grant requested to develop a program under which Juvenile Court wards would be assigned to work projects in the community. The Probation Department would organize and supervise these projects.

Total Costs - \$44,795



APPENDIX B  
MEMBERSHIP OF THE REGIONAL ADVISORY BOARD  
AND TASK FORCES: TASK FORCE REPORTS





REGION V CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADVISORY BOARD

Biographical Sketches

TERRY A. FRANCOIS -

Mr. Francois, an attorney, is a member of the San Francisco County Board of Supervisors and Chairman of the Regional Advisory Board of the California Council on Criminal Justice, Region V.

ALFRED AFFINITO -

Mr. Affinito is in his second term as Councilman in Pittsburg, as well as having his own legal practice. He is President of the East Bay Division of the League of California Cities.

NATHANIEL BATES -

Mr. Bates is a Deputy Probation Officer for Alameda County and a Councilman for the city of Richmond. He is a member of the California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association.

ERNEST BESIG -

An attorney, Mr. Besig has been the Executive Director of the Regional Office of the American Civil Liberties Union for the past thirty-five years.

MRS. CHARLES BLACK -

Mrs. Black is a Public Member of the Advisory Board who is interested in regional problems and has been active in many civic groups in the Bay Area.

THOMAS CAHILL -

Mr. Cahill, who has twenty-seven years of police experience, has been Chief of Police in San Francisco since 1958.

C. W. CAMPBELL -

Currently Vice-Chancellor for Business and Finance at the University of California at Berkeley, a position which he has held since 1964, Mr. Campbell has had numerous positions in municipal government from 1946 through 1963. He was head of Metropolitan Government of Dade County, Florida from 1958 to 1963.



## FRANK COAKLEY -

Mr. Coakley has been Alameda County District Attorney since 1947. His experience with the Alameda County District Attorney's office goes back to 1923 when he joined the staff as a Deputy District Attorney.

## RAYMOND DAVIS -

Mr. Davis has held the position of Chief of Police for Walnut Creek for five years. Prior to this, he spent ten years with the Fullerton, California Police Department, rising to the rank of Captain.

## LYLE EDSON -

Mr. Edson has spent the last five years on the bench of the San Mateo Municipal Court. Before this appointment he was a Deputy District Attorney for San Mateo County.

## CHARLES GAIN -

After twenty-two years as a member of the Oakland Police Department, Mr. Gain assumed the position of Chief of Police in 1967.

## WILLIAM HYDIE -

Mr. Hydrie has served the City of Palo Alto as its Chief of Police since 1952, after holding a similar position in Merced for over four years.

## ALEXANDER IMLAY -

An attorney, Mr. Imlay has served as a Councilman in Sausalito since 1964. He has also been a member of the Marin County, City-County Planning Council.

## RONALD JAMES -

Mr. James has been Mayor of San Jose since 1966. Prior to his election he was a member of the City Council and Chairman of the Planning Commission from 1962-1965.

## THOMAS KONGSGAARD -

Mr. Kongsgaard has been a member of the bench of the Napa County Superior Court since 1959.



## DAVID LAMOREE -

A Vallejo City Councilman since 1965, Mr. Lamoree is on the Executive Committee of the Association of Bay Area Governments and a Commissioner on the Vallejo Housing Authority.

## WILLIAM MULLIGAN -

Mr. Mulligan has spent fifteen years with the Sonoma County Probation Department, the last seven of which have been served in the position of Chief Probation Officer. He is Chairman of the Neurological Handicapped Children's Association and of the Law Committee for the California State Probation Officers' Association. He published "A Study on "Dyslexia and Delinquency," in the Spring 1969 issue of Academic Therapy.

## JOSEPH PEATMAN -

Mr. Peatman has been County Supervisor for Napa County since January, 1969. From 1961 to 1963, he was a Deputy District Attorney in Napa County. He has also served on the Board of Trustees of the Napa Valley Unified School District.

## CHARLES PRELSNIK -

Mr. Prelsник has been Sheriff of Santa Clara County for three years, a position he assumed after serving three years as Undersheriff.

## JOHN H. READING -

Mr. Reading has been Mayor of Oakland since 1966. Prior to his election he was a member of the City Council for five years.

## ARTHUR RUONAVAARA -

Mr. Ruonavaara is in his second term as Sonoma County Supervisor. He served as Councilman in the City of Healdsburg from 1948 to 1954, at which time he was elected Mayor of the city, a position he held until 1962.

## ROBERT ST. CLAIR -

A member of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors since 1967, Mr. St. Clair was appointed Chairman of the Board in January, 1969. He was a Daly City Councilman from 1958 to 1962.



## CARL STUBENRAUCH -

Mr. Stubenrauch is Regional Vice President-Northern California, Pacific Telephone Company. He is a member of the Advisory Board of the Bay Area Regional Government Committee and on the Board of Directors of the Independent Colleges of Northern California.

## WILMONT SWEENEY -

Mr. Sweeney, an attorney, has been a member of the Berkeley City Council since 1961. He is a former member of the State Commission on Housing and Community Development.





## REGION V CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADVISORY BOARD

Task Force MembersORGANIZED CRIME:

Chairman: Barton L. Collins, Chief of Detectives,  
San Jose Police Department

Consultant: Jack Jones, Chief Investigator,  
San Mateo County District Attorney's Office

Members: Thomas Fitzpatrick, Director of Intelligence,  
San Francisco Police Department  
Thomas Johnson, Undersheriff,  
Napa County Sheriff's Department  
N. J. Loschiavo, Lieutenant,  
San Mateo County Sheriff's Department  
Joseph F. McVarish, Supervising Special Agent  
California Department of Justice  
Thomas Monahan, Inspector,  
Alameda County District Attorney's Office

EDUCATION-TRAINING:

Chairman: B. Earle Lewis, Coordinator of Police Services,  
Foothill Junior College District

Consultant: Brian Parker, Professor of Criminalistics  
University of California-Berkeley

Members: Duayne Dillon, Criminalist,  
Martinez  
Melvin L. Hawley, Attorney,  
Los Altos  
William H. Hopper, Chairman, Division of Public Services,  
Chabot College, Hayward  
Erwin Loretz, Director, Western Office,  
Contra Costa Probation Department  
Gordon Misner, Professor of Criminology  
University of California-Berkeley  
Charles Rumph, Attorney,  
San Francisco  
Gregory Stout, Attorney,  
San Francisco



Education-Training, cont.

Vivian Satcher, Program Coordinator  
University of California-Berkeley

Stephen Tamberski, President,  
Northern California Police Training Assoc.

LAW ENFORCEMENT:

Chairman: Edward Kriens, Chief of Police,  
Pleasant Hill

Consultant: Charles Brown, Consultant,  
California Adult Authority

Members: A. Stanley Anderson, Coordinator, Police Science,  
Santa Rosa Junior College  
William Beall, Chief of Police,  
Berkeley  
Vern Coppack, Chief of Police,  
Fairfield  
James Fales, City Manager,  
Pleasanton  
Russell Fisher, Chief of Police,  
Hillsborough  
Austin Thompson, Executive Director,  
Human Rights Commission, Marin Co.  
James D. Wright, Chief of Police,  
Sausalito

JUDICIAL PROCESS:

Chairman: Leonard Dieden, Judge,  
Superior Court of Alameda

Consultant: Donald Matthews, Director, Graduate Studies,  
San Jose State College

Members: George Cannell, Senior Department Chief,  
San Jose Police Department  
George Carroll, Judge,  
Municipal Court, Richmond  
Nathan Cohn, Attorney,  
San Francisco  
Chris Gaspirich, Attorney,  
Oakland  
Joseph Kennedy, Judge,  
Municipal Court, San Francisco



Judicial Process, cont.

William Lerche, Probation Officer,  
Alameda County  
Paul Ligda, Public Defender,  
Solano County  
John Meehen, Deputy District Attorney,  
Alameda County  
Joseph P. Murphy, Jr., Judge,  
Superior Court, Sonoma County  
John Racanelli, Judge,  
Superior Court, Santa Clara County  
Keith Sorenson, District Attorney,  
San Mateo County

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY:

Chairman: Sidney Friedman, Juvenile Probation Officer  
Santa Clara County

Consultant: Charles Simpson, Police Chief (retired)  
Monterey

Members: Mrs. Chris Adams, Member,  
Contra Costa Co. Juvenile Justice Comm.  
John E. Dierman, Attorney,  
San Francisco  
Dr. Marjorie Folinsbee, Psychiatrist  
San Francisco  
Samual Gardner, Judge,  
Superior and Juvenile Court, Marin County  
Paul Green, Director,  
Girls Home, Alameda County  
Darrell Hickman, Juvenile Officer,  
Berkeley Police Department  
William Underwood, Consultant on Delinquency Prevention  
California Youth Authority  
Michael Wald, Professor of Law,  
Stanford University

NARCOTIC, DRUG AND ALCOHOLIC ABUSE:

Chairman: Ronald L. Usher, Town Manager, Corte Madera

Consultant: Hillary Fry, Professor of Public Administration  
California State College, Hayward

Members: Paul Baum, Clinical Psychologist  
University of California-Berkeley  
Warren Binzley, Curriculum Coordinator,  
Marin County Board of Education



# Narcotic, Drug and Alcoholic Abuse, Cont.

Bernard Bradman, Assistant Program Chief  
Mental Health Dept., San Francisco

Thorvald Brown, Captain  
Oakland Police Department

Henry B. Bruyn, Director, Student Health Services,  
University of California-Berkeley

Willie Ellison, Officer, Delinquency Prevention  
Santa Clara County

Joel Fort, M.D.  
San Jose

Hadden W. Roth, Judge,  
Municipal Court, Marin County

James Schwendhelm, Lieutenant,  
Marin County Sheriff's Department

Richard Skewis, Probation Officer  
Alameda County

Donald O. Thomson, Director, Adult Probation (retired)  
Oakland

Clinton Wright, Chief of Police,  
Fremont

## RIOTS AND DISORDERS:

Chairman: Robert R. Cazaad, Deputy Chief,  
Oakland Police Department

Consultant: Robert G. Barthol, Instructor of Police Science  
Chabot Junior College, Hayward

Members: Bruce R. Baker, Captain  
Berkeley Police Department

George Cherry, Principal  
Brett Harte Junior High School

Robert Clancy, Battalion Chief,  
San Francisco Fire Department

Harold J. Moore, Community Relations  
Richmond

David R. Sollenberger, City Manager  
Vallejo

Mrs. Kathrine Williams, Community Organizer,  
Richmond





CORRECTIONS:

Chairman: Richard R. Korn, Professor of Criminology,  
University of California, Berkeley

Consultant: David Fogel, Instructor, Laney College, Oakland

Members:

Ernie Allen, President, SATE

Peggy Baer, Assistant Superintendent, Los Guillicos  
School for Girls

David Deitch, President, Concepts West

Douglas Grant, President, New Careers Development Project

Mike James, New Careerist, New Careers Development Project

James Robison, Research Analyst, School of Criminology,  
University of California, Berkeley

Theodore Winkleman, Director, Adult Probation, Alameda County



7902740  
[insert]  
/

ASSOCIATION OF



BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

HOTEL CLAREMONT, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94705 • 841-9730

March 31, 1969

Mr. Jack D. Maltester, President  
Association of Bay Area Governments  
Claremont Hotel  
Berkeley, California 94705

Dear President Maltester:

I would like to thank you and the members of the Executive Committee for the invitation to attend the April 17, 1969 meeting of the Executive Committee for the purpose of discussing the work of the Regional Criminal Justice Advisory Board to date.

Attached to this letter you will find a copy of the Board's just-completed preliminary report, A Program Design for Criminal Justice Planning in the San Francisco Bay Region, which was approved in principle by the Board on March 15, 1969. I regret that printing and mailing restrictions made it impossible to prepare copies of the report for the March 20 Executive Committee Meeting.

The following principal recommendations contained in the report are submitted for consideration and approval at the April 17 meeting.

1. The Criminal Justice Advisory Board should continue its relationship to the Association of Bay Area Governments as a policy advisory body for criminal justice planning.
2. Criminal Justice Planning and Research resources should be established within the framework of the Association of Bay Area Governments to continue and enlarge upon the initial work of the various task forces.
3. The Association of Bay Area Governments should occupy a positive role in the processing of applications for federal grants as provided by the Safe Streets Act; reorganization of the Regional Advisory Board to accomplish this objective should be considered.

Mr. Jack D. Maltester  
March 31, 1969

Page Two

4. The Association's criminal justice planning staff should be augmented as necessary to implement the above recommendations.
5. Funds to carry these programs forward should be requested for the above purposes as provided by the Safe Streets Act.

Cordially,

*Terry A. Francois*

Terry A. Francois  
Chairman  
Criminal Justice Advisory Board

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124909988





ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA